REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 068 24
THE STUDENT AND THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY--A STUDY OF ATTRITION AND PERSISTENCE IN A HIGHLY SELECTIVE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE.
BY- NEWMAN, MARY ALICE
CHICAGO UNIV.
REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-130 PUB DATE 65
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8231
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$6.00 150P.

DESCRIPTORS- DROPOUTS, *DROPOUT RESEARCH, *COLLEGE STUDENTS, *EDUCATIONAL POLICY, DROPOUT PREVENTION, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, *GUIDANCE COUNSELING, *SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY WERE (1) TO DETERMINE THE INCIDENCE OF DROPOUT IN A GIVEN COLLEGE CLASS, (2) TO DESCRIBE THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DROPOUTS (OBTAINED FROM INTERVIEWS), (3) TO DETERMINE THE KINDS AND CAUSES OF DROPOUTS, AND (4) TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND STUDENT SERVICES. SIXTY DROPOUTS AND A COMPARABLE NUMBER OF GRADUATES WERE INTERVIEWED IN 1963 AND 1964. EVIDENCE INDICATED THAT DROPOUT IS NOT RELATED SO MUCH TO LACK OF ABILITY AS TO PERSONAL VALUES AND CHARACTERISTICS. IT IS ALSO CONCLUDED THAT THE OFFERINGS OF THE INSTITUTION AND THE COMPATIBILITY OF THE STUDENTS' GOALS AND VALUES WITH THE INSTITUTION'S AIMS WERE IMPORTANT DETERMINERS OF THE DROPOUT RATE. (JK)

ED003068

5-8231

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE STUDENT AND THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY:

A Study of Attrition and Persistence in a Highly Selective Liberal Arts College

Dr. Mary Alice Newman

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

1965

Cooperative Research Project No. S-130

Portions of the Research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface 1

Introduction 4

Chapter One 8

Chapter Two 15

Chapter Three 37

Chapter Four 44

Chapter Five 72

Chapter Six 76

Appendix:

I. Interview Guide 89

II. Interview Ratings 111

III. Correlations Between Selected Quantitative and Qualitative Variables for Drop Outs Interviewed 144

PREFACE

This project had its inception in 1959, six years ago, in my random observations of the experiences of freshmen students at the University of Chicago.

That these informal observations have become the present detailed study of a college class is the result of the interest, the efforts, the enthusiasm and the devotion of students, colleagues, and fellow-workers who have consistently exceeded the call of duty in their contributions to the creation of this study.

The candor of the students in this class first suggested this project, and their continuing interest and cooperation has made it possible.

From the first, the enthusiasm, support, and patience of my colleagues, Warner Wick, Dean of Students, and George L. Playe, Dean of Undergraduate Students, have played a major role in bringing the project to fruition.

I am indebted immeasurably to Dr. Philip Tripp, of the United States Office of Education, who took an early interest in the project, and to Dr. Karen Landmark and Dr. Howard Hjelm, of the United States Office of Education, for the small contract grant which made this study possible. Without this aid the present form of the study could not have been attempted.

Mrs. Elizabeth Ireland and Mrs. Judy Leonard formerly of the College Office originally assembled all the quantitative data on the class. During a period of eighteen months, they volunteered their efforts - of their own good will and interest in the endeavor - to examine the 548 student records and extract all quantitative data from student cases into usable form. Without this massive undertaking on their part, the valuable quantitative data for the entire class would not have been available for analysis and statistical treatment during this year.

The three Staff members of the project during this grant year - Dr. Betty E. Orr, Dr. Walter Folly, and Mr. Keith Keeling - have consistently and overwhelmingly given of themselves, their time, and their talent to produce a project far beyond the original description.

Dr. Betty Orr of the University of Illinois has served as Consultant on project design and analysis and has given countless hours at all phases of design, analysis, and compilation. Without her expert advice and assistance I could not have completed this project.

Mr. Keith J. Keeling of the College has served the project with unfailing skill and competence, and untiring loyalty. During the summer-autumn of 1964, he contacted and interviewed the entire Drop Out Interview sample, and during the winter-spring of 1965 he painstakingly verified and prepared all quantitative data for computer analysis.

Dr. Walter Foley of the University of Iowa, Statistical Consultant, has been of invaluable assistance, both in his competence and in his enthusiastic interest in the project. He did extensive computer analysis of all data, quantitative and qualitative. His exhaustive treatment of the data is remarkable, and has run to well over 1000 pages of computer print-off.

Mrs. Sandra Bateman, my excellent secretary, and Miss Jeanne Hudson, of the College Office, have worked with unfailing efficiency and good humour in preparing all the stencils for the project and have given encouragement and cheer as well as invaluable secretarial assistance.

Finally, I express my sincere appreciation to my colleague and husband, James E. Newman, Assistant Dean of Students, whose interest and forebearance have made possible my concentrated efforts during this year.

This task was undertaken with a single motive: to serve more effectively the educational and personal needs of our students through increased understanding. If this Report furthers this aim, the effort and devotion which have been given in such measure to this study will have been justified.

Mary Alice Newman
Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Students
Assistant Professor of History

University of Chicago
July, 1965

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This Report is a case history of a college class. It attempts to describe what happens to a college class in a five-year span following the date of first matriculation with specific attention to the nature and causes of attrition and with special concern for the implications of the findings for educational policy.

Specifically, this Report compares Drop Outs with Graduates quantitatively in terms of tangible characteristics, contrasts Drop Outs with Graduates qualitatively in terms of individual expectations, characteristics, values, and experiences, and suggests possible implications raised by these findings for those concerned with educational policy and student services.

SPONSORSHIP OF THE STUDY

This study was made possible by a grant from the United States Office of Education. Through this generous support, the Project Staff undertook in the summer-autumn of 1964 to interview a representative sample of Drop Outs from the Class of 1963 of the College of the University of Chicago. By detailed interviewing of 55 subjects, we hoped to accomplish two purposes: first, to learn more about the basic nature and causes of withdrawal; and second, to draw such implications as findings might suggest about the functioning of student personnel services at the pre-collegiate and collegiate level.

This Drop Out Interview project was not an isolated interest but the outgrowth of some five years of informal and formal study of the Class of 1963. Much data had been gathered on the class as a whole, and an interview project -

similar in scope and procedure - had been conducted with 52 graduates of the class in the spring quarter of their senior year.

Once the interviewing of the Drop Outs had been completed and the analysis of the interviews began, it became increasingly apparent to the Project Staff that the value of the Drop Out Interviews would be immeasurably enhanced were it possible to compare this sample to the class as a whole, on one hand, and to the comparable sample of Graduates (Persisters) on the other. Therefore, spurred by the encouragement and support of the United States Office grant for the Drop Out Interview project, we undertook to increase the scope of the total project and to prepare, as auxiliary projects, both the quantitative data on the entire class and the qualitative data on the interview sample of Graduates for computer analysis similar to that planned for the Drop Out Interview group.

This Report describes, therefore, the results of both the original Drop Out Interviews and the auxiliary projects. As a result, it is a more comprehensive and detailed Report than would originally have been possible. The purposes of the project remain the same: to learn more about the basic nature and causes of withdrawal as compared to persistence, and to suggest implications from the findings for general educational policy. The purposes remain the same, but the quantitative description of characteristics of the total class, the quantitative comparison of characteristics of all Persisters and all Drop Outs in the total class, and the qualitative comparison of Drop Out Interviewees with a comparable sample of Graduate Interviewees has considerably enhanced the scope and, hopefully, the value of this study.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

In the spring of 1959, some 548 members of the Class of 1963 at the University of Chicago were admitted and accepted admission from the 1444 applications for admission to this class received by the University.

Five years later, in June of 1964, 309 or 56.4% of this group had graduated from the College, 21 or 3.8% were still attending the College, and 218 or 39.8% of the original group had withdrawn and not returned during the five year period.

In the effort to understand the nature of causes of withdrawal, as contrasted to persistence, this Report is organized as follows.

The total college class of 1963 is described in terms of tangible and quantitative characteristics in Chapter One.

Chapter Two contrasts, in terms of these 38 quantitative characteristics the 218 Drop Outs with the 309 Persisters in the class.

Inter-correlations were run between all of these characteristics, and an inter-correlation matrix of significant variables was established. Significantly, inter-correlated variables, contrasting Drop Outs and Persisters, and their possible implications are described in Chapter Three.

In order to understand the highly complex personal reasons and motivations for Drop Out, as compared to persistence, two groups of students from the total class was interviewed in detail. A group of 52 Persisters were interviewed by the author in the spring quarter of 1963, their final year in college. Under the auspices of the grant from the United States Office of Education, a group of 60 Drop Outs was contacted and visited at their current residences in the summer and fall of 1964. These detailed interviews were rated, analyzed, and treated statistically. Chapter Four contrasts this group of Drop Outs with the interviewed Graduates in terms of their responses on the Interviews.

As a result of the significant statistical contrasts between the qualitative interview responses of Drop Outs and Graduates, seven inter-correlation matrices were established. The significance of these findings with respect to individual expectations, characteristics, values, and experiences for the group of interviewed Drop Outs is discussed in Chapter Five.

In conclusion, Chapter Six suggests the implications of findings for educational policy and student services.

METHODOLOGY

As more than one set of procedures has been employed in the several sub-projects reported in this report, the procedures and methods employed will be discussed with each Chapter rather than in an introductory section on methodology.

CHAPTER ONE

In September, 1959, 548 young men and women thronged the green and pleasant Quadrangles of the University of Chicago for the first time. As the Class of 1963, these students were the fortunate ones admitted from the more than 1444 who had applied for admission to the class.

The story of this class is the subject of this Study. Who were these students ... What happened to them ... How many succeeded ... How many did not succeed ... And, above all .. Why.

On that first autumn day, as we look at the Class - select and selective, talented and able, eager and apprehensive - the story is all before us. And yet, even as we look at this Class, much of the untold story is in some measure already determined.

The 354 men and 194 women of the Class of 1963 came from thirty-nine states, the District of Columbia, and three foreign countries. 26, or 5%, of them had been admitted as Early Entrants prior to completion of the high school diploma. Members of the Class ranged in age from 15 to 26, but the majority were 17-19 years at entrance.

TABLE I-A

Sex Distribution of Entrants

	Entrants	
Categories	Number	Percent
Men	354	64
Women	194	35
TOTAL	548	

TABLE I-B

Age Distribution of Entrants

	Entrants	
Categories	Number	Percent
24 or older	4	0
23	2	0
22	3	0
21	3	0
20	5	0
19	33	6
18	338	61
17	141	25
16	16	2
15	2	0
No data	1	0
TOTAL	548	

Their SAT scores on the College Entrance Examination Board examinations attested to their generally high ability. The class median was 618 on the Verbal Score; 630 on the Math Score.

TABLE I-C

Distribution of S.A.T. Verbal Scores of Entrants

	Entrants	
Categories	Number	Percent
701-800	93	17
601-700	224	41
501-600	192	35
401-500	32	6
Below 400	1	0
No data	6	1
TOTAL	548	

TABLE I-D

Distribution of S.A.T. Math Scores of Entrants

	Entrants	
Categories	Number	Percent
701-800	100	18
601-700	248	46
501-600	151	28
401-500	39	7
Below 400	4	1
No data	6	1
TOTAL	548	

In religious preference and in geographical distribution, members of the Class of 1963 showed themselves to be interestingly diverse. For the most part, however, they came from urban or suburban homes - town and country dewllers among them representing only 12% of the class.

TABLE I-E

Religious Preference of Entrants

Categories	Entrants Number	Percent
Jewish preference	185	33
Jewish cultural background, no religion	4	0
Catholic, Greek Orthodox	76	13
Protestant, unspecified	25	4
Episcopalian, Unitarian, Congregational, Presbyterian	94	17
Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Quaker, E & R	104	19
Christian Science	2	0
Mission Covenant, United Brethren, Seventh Day Advent	7	1
Ethical Culture	3	0
No preference	10	1
Atheist, Agnostic	37	6
No data	1	0
TOTAL	548	

TABLE I-F

Home: Urban/Rural

Categories	Entrants Number	Percent
Urban	319	58
Suburban	149	27
Town	47	8
Rural	32	5
No data	1	0
TOTAL	548	

TABLE I-G

Home: Regional Area

	Entrants	
Categories	Number	Percent
New England	14	2
Mid-Atlantic	124	22
South	27	4
Midwest	108	19
Chicago Area	206	37
Southwest	11	2
Plains States	16	2
Northwest	15	2
California	23	4
Non-U.S.	3	0
No Data	1	0
TOTAL	548	

Moreover, their general caliber as a class was documented by high school records: grade averages, class rank, and recommendations.

TABLE I-H

Distribution of High School Averages of Entrants

	Entrants	
Categories	Number	Percent
A	195	35
A-	90	16
B+	135	24
B	53	9
B-	44	8
C+	18	3
C	5	0
C-	2	0
No data	6	0
TOTAL	548	

TABLE I-I

Distribution of High School Class Rank of Entrants

	Entrants	
Categories	Number	Percent
Upper 5%	206	37
Upper 10%	85	15
Upper 25%	124	22
Upper Half	65	11
Lower Half	23	4
No Data	45	8
TOTAL	548	

TABLE I-J

Distribution of High School Recommendations of Entrants

Categories [1]	Entrants Number	 Percent
Enthusiastic	23	4
Strong	212	38
Good	210	38
Mixed	23	4
Qualified	58	10
No Data	22	3
TOTAL	548	

What, then, was to be the fortune of this class?

By June of 1963, four years following matriculation, 240, or 43.8% of the group, had graduated; and 217 or 39.6% of the group, had withdrawn. By June of 1964, five years following matriculation, 309, or 56.4% had graduated, 218, or 39.8% had withdrawn. and 21, or 3.8% were still in residence.

Thus, of the original group of 354 men and 194 women, 137 men and 82 women, 218, or 39.8% of the class had withdrawn.

Able, intelligent - all. What, then, were the factors which determined success, failure, transfer, or termination for these students? To search out and examine these factors is the province and purpose of our Study.

---

[1] These catagories were established by Project staff after extensive study of samples of secondary school recommendation forms. The single word evaluations — i.e. enthusiastic, strong, good, mixed, qualified — were established as rough descriptions of the over-all tone of the qualitative recommendation, be it letter, essay, or simple check list.

CHAPTER TWO

Underlying the design of this research is the hypothesis that intangible qualities are major factors in the phenomena of Drop Out and Persistence. Nonetheless, examination of demographic and quantitative data is of undeniable importance to understanding factors producing Drop Out and Persistence and an essential prerequisite to further exploration.

University records contain extensive demographic and quantitative student data. Through the efforts of Mrs. Ireland and Mrs. Leonard, (p. 1) the data for this class was first collected and put into usable form. During this Project year, Mr. Keeling undertook extensive verification and preparation of this data for statistical treatment as essential background for the qualitative analysis of the interviews.

This chapter presents a Graphic description of quantitative and demographic facts concerning personal, parental, high school, admissions, and matriculation data for Drop Outs and Persisters of the Class of 1963.

Personal Data

The following eight Tables (II-A through II-H) describe and compare the 309 Persisters and 21[illegible] Drop Outs with regard to Personal factors including Sex, Age at Entrance, SAT scores, Religious Preference, Geographic Origin, and Marital Status.

The 21 students still in residence at Project Terminus, June, 1964, are not included in these tables, except as noted in Tables II-T and II-U.

TABLE II-A

Sex

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Men	205	66	137	63
Women	104	33	81	36
TOTAL	309		218	

We see in Table II-A that the Drop Out rate for women is slightly higher than that for men. Nonetheless, it is not high as compared to the national drop out rate for women nor as compared to the national man/woman drop out ratio.

TABLE II-B

Age at Entrance

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
24 or older	0	0	4	1
23	0	0	2	0
22	0	0	3	1
21	0	0	3	1
20	1	0	4	1
19	12	3	20	9
18	198	64	128	58
17	85	27	49	22
16	12	3	4	1
15	1	0	1	0
TOTAL	309		218	

The numbers are statistically small; nonetheless, it is interesting to note the low survival rate of students whose age at entrance exceeds the conventional.

TABLE II-C

S.A.T. Verbal

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
701-800	58	19	29	14
601-700	136	44	77	36
501-600	103	33	90	42
401-500	11	4	19	8
No Data	1	0	3	0
TOTAL	309		218	

As might be expected, students with higher S.A.T.'s have increased likelihood of success. Nonetheless, the range of S.A.T.'s among Drop Outs is interesting and significant. 50% of the Drop Outs are in the "Above 600" verbal range; obviously, S.A.T. scores or ability alone do not provide definitive explanations of success/failure.

TABLE II-D

S.A.T. Math

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
701-800	72	24	26	12
601-700	138	46	90	42
501-600	79	25	71	33
401-500	16	6	23	11
Below 400	0	0	4	2
No Data	4	0	4	2
TOTAL	309		218	

It is interesting to note that the student with the 700-800 "Q" score appears to have a 3 to 1 chance for success, even better than the 2 to 1 chance of the 700-800 verbal student.

TABLE II-E

Religious Preference

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percen
Jewish preference	134	43	48	22
Jewish cultural background; no religion	2	0	2	0
Catholic, Greek Orthodox	31	10	41	18
Protestant, unspecified	13	4	12	5
Episcopalian, Unitarian, Congregational, Presbyterian	51	16	41	18
Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Quaker, E & R	54	17	41	18
Christian Science	1	0	1	0
Mission Covenant, United Brethren, Seventh Day Advent	4	1	3	1
Ethical Culture	3	0	0	0
No preferenct	4	1	5	2
Atheist, Agnostic	12	3	23	10
No Data	0	5	1	6
TOTAL	309		218	

The success of Jewish students at Chicago is to be noted. While comprising one third (33%) of the entrants, they represent 43% of the graduates and only 22% of the Drop Outs. Catholics, on the other hand, drop out at almost twice the rate of graduates; while Protestants graduate slightly fewer than half of those who enter.

TABLE II-E

Religious Preference

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percen
Jewish preference	134	43	48	22
Jewish cultural background; no religion	2	0	2	0
Catholic, Greek Orthodox	31	10	41	18
Protestant, unspecified	13	4	12	5
Episcopalian, Unitarian, Congregational, Presbyterian	51	16	41	18
Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Quaker, E & R	54	17	41	18
Christian Science	1	0	1	0
Mission Covenant, United Brethren, Seventh Day Advent	4	1	3	1
Ethical Culture	3	0	0	0
No preferenct	4	1	5	2
Atheist, Agnostic	12	3	23	10
No Data	0	5	1	6
TOTAL	309		218	

The success of Jewish students at Chicago is to be noted. While comprising one third (33%) of the entrants, they represent 43% of the graduates and only 22% of the Drop Outs. Catholics, on the other hand, drop out at almost twice the rate of graduates; while Protestants graduate slightly fewer than half of those who enter.

TABLE II-F

Home: Urban/Rural

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Urban (25,000+)	193	62	114	52
Suburban	84	27	60	27
Town (5000-25,000)	21	6	24	11
Rural (less than 5,000)	11	3	19	8
No Data	0	0	1	0
TOTAL	309		218	

While small in numbers, it is interesting to note that the drop out rate for those few students coming from small towns and rural areas is twice as large in this class as the graduation rate.

TABLE II-G

Home: Regional Area

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
New England	7	2	7	3
Mid-Atlantic	76	24	45	20
South	16	5	10	4
Midwest	57	18	47	21
Chicago Area	120	38	77	35
Southwest	5	1	5	2
Plains States	11	3	4	1
Northwest	8	2	7	3
California	8	2	14	6
Non-U.S.	0	0	0	0
No Data	0	0	2	0
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-H

Student Marital Status

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single throughout study	286	92	192	88
Married before matriculation	0	0	3	1
Married while at Chicago	22	7	21	9
Divorced while at Chicago	0	0	0	0
No Data	1	0	2	0
TOTAL	309		218	

Parental Data

Tables II-I through II-L describe and compare the 309 Persisters and 219 Drop Outs with regard to Parental marital status, mortality, education, and occupation.

TABLE II-I

Parental Personal Status

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Parents living together	223	72	169	77
Separated (including divorce)	23	7	19	8
Father deceased	20	6	16	7
Mother deceased	8	2	7	3
Both parents deceased	2	0	1	0
No data	33	10	6	2
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-J

Parental Education

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Both less than high school	20	6	25	11
Father high school; Mother less	12	3	6	2
Mother high school, Father less	20	6	15	6
Both high school	43	13	30	13
Father college; Mother less than high school	6	1	2	0
Father college; Mother high school	49	15	40	18
Mother college; Father less than high school	11	3	9	4
Mother college;father high school	19	6	13	5
Both College	129	41	76	35
No data	0	0	2	0
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-K

Father's Occupation

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Status #1 [1] e.g.(Lawyers, M.D.'s, large business owners, ministers, judges, engineers, major executives, etc.)	95	30	52	23
Status #2 e.g.(high school teachers, librarians, accountants, middle business owners, assistant managers.)	52	16	45	20
Status #3 e.g.(social workers, grade school teachers, minor executives, small business owners, salesmen, civil servants.)	76	24	40	18
Status #4 e.g.(factory foremen, electricians, plumbers, stenographers, very small business owners, bookkeepers.)	26	8	24	11
Status #5 e.g.(clerks, telephone operators, repairmen, medium-skilled workers, tenant farmers, mechanics, cooks, bartenders, practical nurses.)	26	8	25	11
Status #6 e.g.(semi-skilled workers, night watchmen, taxi/truck drivers, waitresses.)	14	4	11	5
Status #7 e.g.(heavy labor, migrants, janitors, scrub women.)	5	1	6	2
No data	15	4	15	6
TOTAL	309		218	

---

[1] W. Lloyd Warner, "Revised Scale for Rating Occupations"; Social Class in America, Harper Brothers, New York, 1960; p. 140.

TABLE II-L

Mother's Occupation

(See preceding scale for definitions)	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Housewife [1]	208	67	126	58
Status #1	4	1	7	3
Status #2	19	6	9	4
Status #3	32	10	33	15
Status #4	24	7	20	9
Status #5	8	2	7	3
Status #6	10	3	8	3
Status #7	0	0	0	0
No data	4	1	8	4
TOTAL	309		218	

Thus, once more while the statistics are not heghly significant, it is interesting to note that the general thrust of Parental Education was higher for Persisters than for Drop Outs and that some 70% of Persisters had fathers in the first three occupational ratings, as compared to 61% of Drop Outs.

67% of Persisters were children of non-working mothers as compared to 58% of Drop Outs.

---

1. A modification of the Warner scale used in preceding rating.

High School Data

The following three tables, II-M through II-O, describe and compare Persisters and Drop Outs with regard to High School averages, class rank, and recommendations.

TABLE II-M

High School Average

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	136	44	51	23
A-	50	16	36	16
B+	78	25	53	24
B	19	6	32	14
B-	18	5	23	10
C+	7	2	11	5
C	1	0	4	1
C-	0	0	2	0
No Data	0	0	1	0
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-N

High School Class Rank

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Upper 5%	138	44	61	28
Upper 10%	49	15	30	13
Upper 25%	64	20	56	25
Upper half	28	9	35	16
Lower half	4	1	19	8
No data	26	8	17	8
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-O

High School Recommendations

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percen
Enthusiastic	13	4	9	4
Strong	146	47	55	25
Good	104	33	99	45
Mixed	12	3	11	5
Qualified	25	8	32	14
No data	9	2	12	6
TOTAL	309		218	

Once more, as might be expected, the evidence collects slightly in the favor of the Persisters: high school averages, particularly at the A range and at the lower range, class rank, and "strong" recommendations.

Admissions Data

The following three Tables (II-P through II-R) describe and compare the Persisters and Drop Outs with regard to early entrance, admission rating, and admission warning.

TABLE II-P

Early Entrance

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Early entrants	17	5	6	2
High School graduates	292	94	212	97
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-Q

Admissions Ratings

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	26	8	3	1
2	76	24	9	4
3	98	31	32	14
Ratings raised to admit	16	5	5	2
Student applied 3/1-5/1/59	48	15	114	52
Student applied after 5/1/59	41	13	50	23
Early decision	3	0	2	0
No data	1	0	3	1
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-R

Admissions Warnings

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Drop Outs
No Warning	259	83	141	64
Low Verbal S.A.T.	5	1	9	4
Low Math S.A.T.	7	2	9	4
Low Both S.A.T.	8	2	8	3
High School Record	9	2	11	5
Personality	4	1	10	4
Psychiatric	8	2	7	3
Family Situation	2	0	6	2
No Data	7	2	17	8
TOTAL	309		218	

The data on Admissions Ratings appears to confirm both the predictability of Admissions Ratings made by Admissions Staff and the wisdom of the decision to close application for admissions in mid-spring and to discourage late applications. Additionally, it is perhaps not surprising that 36% of Admission warnings were given to Drop Outs as compared to 17% Persisters.

Matriculation and Residence Data

The following ten Tables, II-S through II-bb, describe and compare the 309 Persisters and 218 Drop Outs with regard to various factors of College residence and performance: number of quarters residence, academic status, pattern of major field selection, cumulative grade average, academic probation, evaluations of Attitudes and Function, financial aid, part-time work, and residence.

TABLE II-S

Number of Quarters in Residence at Chicago

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Up to one quarter	0	0	23	10
One-two quarters	0	0	10	4
Two-three quarters	0	0	43	19
One-two school years	1	0	84	38
Two-three school years	25	8	35	16
Three-four school years	222	71	16	7
Four-five school years	61	19	6	2
No data	0	0	1	0
TOTAL	309		218	

Thus, it is apparent that the majority of Drop Out (71%) takes place during the first two years. Similarly, the majority of graduates (79%) received their degrees within four years.

TABLE II-T (a)

Academic Status at Project Terminus June, 1964

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Barred from return	0	0	72	33
Voluntary withdrawal	0	0	146	67
Graduated in 3 years or less	26	8	0	0
Graduated in 3-4 years, continuous	214	69	0	0
Graduated in 4-5 years, continuous	47	15	0	0
Barred/withdrew; returned and graduated	22	7	0	0
TOTAL	309		218	

Note: These 21 students, still in residence at Project Terminus are not counted as Drop Outs or Persisters but as a separate group. They are described here and in the next table only in this chapter.

(b)

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Continually in residence; still attending	5	23	0	0
Barred/withdrew; returned and still attending	16	76	0	0
TOTAL	21		0	

Note: The table on the following page (p.30-31)is presented in full rather than abridged form in order to provide comparisons between sex of students as well as major fields.

The following are the categories for TABLE II-U on the following page.

	When Entering		When Leaving
1.	Physical Science	to	Biological Science
2.	Physical Science	to	Social Science
3.	Physical Science	to	Humanities
4.	Biological Science	to	Physical Science
5.	Biological Science	to	Social Science
6.	Biological Science	to	Humanities
7.	Social Science	to	Physical Science
8.	Social Science	to	Biological Science
9.	Social Science	to	Humanities
10.	Humanities	to	Physical Science
11.	Humanities	to	Biological Science
12.	Humanities	to	Social Science
13.	Undecided	to	Physical Science
14.	Undecided	to	Biological Science
15.	Undecided	to	Social Science
16.	Undecided	to	Humanities
17.	No change		Physical Science
18.	No change		Biological Science
19.	No change		Social Science
20.	No change		Humanities
21.	No change		Undecided
22.	Division	to	Tutorial Studies
23.	Division	to	Business
24.	No change		Business
25.	Division	to	Law
26.	No change		Law

(Those switching from Tutorial Studies or Program options, to a division, e.g., Humanities, classify as 'Undecided to Humanities', etc.

Patterns of Major Field Selection

Category	Graduates		TOTAL	Drop Outs		TOTAL	Still in College		TOTAL	TOTAL			
	M.	F.		M.	F.		M.	F.		M.	F.	TOTAL	%
1	6	4	10	5	1	6	0	0	0	11	5	16	3
2	15	4	19	7	2	9	0	1	1	22	7	29	5
3	6	1	7	6	2	8	1	1	2	13	4	17	3
4	3	1	4	1	0	1			0	4	1	5	0
5	7	8	15	2	1	3			0	9	9	18	3
6	6	6	12	0	2	2			0	6	8	14	3
7	0	1	1	0	0	0			0	0	1	1	0
8	1	1	2	1	0	1			0	2	1	3	0
9	5	5	10	1	0	1			0	6	5	11	2
10	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0
11	2	1	3	0	0	0			0	2	1	3	0
12	2	5	7	1	0	1			0	3	5	8	1
13	0	0	0	1	0	1			0	1	0	1	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0
15	18	4	22	3	1	4	1		1	22	5	27	5
16	3	0	3	1	2	3			0	4	2	6	1
17	53	7	60	38	10	48	3	1	4	94	18	112	22
18	24	10	34	22	7	29		1	1	46	18	64	12
19	24	27	51	9	17	26	3	2	5	36	46	82	16
20	20	16	36	10	19	29	2	2	4	32	37	69	13
21	0	0	0	9	5	14			0	9	5	14	2
22	3	3	6	0	0	0			0	3	3	6	1
23	2	0	2	2	0	2			0	4	0	4	1
24	3	0	3	2	1	3			0	5	1	6	0
25	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0
26	1	0	1	2	0	2			0	3	0	3	0
TOTAL	204	104	308	123	70	193	10	8	18	337	182	519	
	No data		1	No data		25	No data		3	No data		29	
518			309			218			21			548	

TABLE II-V

Cumulative Grade Average

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
3.5 and above	27	8	2	0
3.0 - 3.49	52	16	15	6
2.5 - 2.99	107	34	12	5
2.0 - 2.49	104	33	44	20
1.75 - 1.99	16	5	30	13
1.0 - 1.74	2	0	86	39
Below 1.0	0	0	18	8
Left before receiving grades	0	0	10	4
No data	1	0	1	0
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-W

Academic Probation

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Students not on Probation	263	85	119	54
On Probation at some point	46	14	96	44
No data	0	0	3	1
TOTAL	309		218	

Once more, while the incidence of poorer cumulative grade average and higher probation census among Drop Outs is to be noted; so too, does it seem inappropriate to consider academic ability the single determinant and explanation of Drop Out and/or failure.

TABLE II-X

Advisory-Resident Head Evaluations of Student Functioning

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mixed evaluation, i.e., disagreement among evaluators.	3	0	17	7
Highly positive evaluation.	50	16	1	0
Positive evaluation: good all round person and student.	82	26	13	5
Satisfactory evaluation - no notable problems.	77	24	12	5
Some qualifications in evaluation; student functioning more satisfactorily than not.	65	21	36	16
Difficulty noted with personality and/ or behavior.	21	6	42	19
Emotional difficulty expected; student functioning with difficulty.	8	2	51	23
Severe emotional difficulty; student functioning erratically or poorly.	3	0	15	6
Breakdown in functioning; hospitalization or emotional break.	0	0	3	1
Severe discipline difficulty; suspension or withdrawal	0	0	23	10
No data	0	0	5	2
TOTAL	309		218	

In view of perceptions on the part of some students that Advisers are interested only in mechanics of scheduling rather than students as people, (below, Chapter Four) it is interesting to note this high incidence of recognition by Advisers and Residence Staff of personal difficulty among Drop Outs.

TABLE II-Y

Advisory-Residence Evaluations of Student Attitudes

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No dissatisfaction noted.	250	80	47	21
Dislikes general atmosphere of University of Chicago.	9	2	27	12
Dislikes course work, teachers, or other academic aspects of University of Chicago.	2	0	20	9
Dislikes general studies program.	0	0	5	2
Dislikes major field course work.	6	1	7	3
Discouraged about academic achievement and/or progress.	9	2	49	22
Became interested in field not offered at University of Chicago.	2	0	9	4
Difficulty with external circumstances-family problems.	15	4	31	14
Difficulty with external circumstances-family pressures to withdraw.	1	0	3	1
Difficulty with external circumstances-financial problems.	15	4	18	8
No data	0	0	2	0
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-Z

Financial Aid

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Aid	214	69	115	52
No Aid	94	30	97	44
No data	1	0	6	3
TOTAL	309		218	

TABLE II-aa

Part-time Work

A

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No work			30	50
0-5 hours weekly	NO		5	8
6-10 goure weekly			9	15
11-15 hours weekly	DATA		6	10
16-20 hours weekly			4	7
21-25 hours weekly			3	5
Over 25 hours weekly			3	5
TOTAL			60	

This table is incomplete as it was not feasible to obtain accurate figures on work hours for non-interviewed drop outs or for graduates. The figures in the chart above are for interviewed drop outs. Of these, half had not worked, while half held jobs ranging from less than five hours a week to virtually full time work. This limited evidence would suggest that work, as such, was not a major determinant of drop out.

TABLE II-bb

Residence at Time of Graduation/Withdrawal

	Persisters		Drop Outs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
University Residence Hall	136	44	120	55
Fraternity House	27	8	18	8
Private Apartment	112	36	44	20
Home	27	8	32	14
No data	7	2	4	2
TOTAL	309		218	

This table gives interesting information with regard to the residence of graduates. As 71% of Drop Out takes place during the first two years, however, it says little about the residence of Drop Outs other than that many of them were in dormitory residence during the early years in the College.

In sum, it has been the purpose of this chapter to describe and contrast Drop Outs and Persisters with regard to quantitative and demographic data drawn from University records. Significant inter-correlations among these several variables are described in Chapter Three, preliminary to the major focus of the Study – the qualitative contrasts in characteristics and experiences of Drop Outs and Persisters

CHAPTER THREE [1]

In addition to the descriptive statistical analysis of the demographic data presented in Chapters 1 and 2, the demographic and quantitative data was analyzed by group and sex for relationship between variables. The Chi Square method of analysis was used, with 440 analyses made by computer.

Of the 440 Chi Square analyses there were only six which were significant at the five per cent or one per cent level of confidence.

When the meanings of these six analyses was examined, none of them proved to be significant for the purposes of this Study. Hence, these will not be reported here.

Inasmuch as the College uses various indices including scholastic aptitude tests scores, high school grade-point averages, and class rank as predictors of academic performance, we were particularly interested in examining relevant variables to ascertain what relationships might exist between them.

Intercorrelations for men and women graduates and drop outs were computed on the following variables: S.A.T. verbal score, S.A.T. mathematics score, high school grade-point average, rank in high school class, high school recommendations, and grade-point average at Chicago. Results of the intercorrelations appear in Tables III-A and III-B below. In addition, a test of significance of differences between graduates and drop outs on each of the correlations was computed. Significant differences between the two groups are noted on the tables.

---

[1] The author is indebted to Dr. Betty Orr of the University of Illinois for the preparation of Chapter hree and Chapter Five.

TABLE III-A

Intercorrelations of Indices of Academic Performance for Women Graduates and Drop Outs

Group	Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Graduate Drop Out	1. S.A.T. Verbal Score					
Graduate Drop Out	2. S.A.T. Math Score	.30 * .72				
Graduate Drop Out	3. High School Grade-Point Average	- .06 .17	-.22 -.07			
Graduate Drop Out	4. Rank in High School Class	- .13 + .16	-.11 -.04	.52* .75		
Graduate Drop Out	5. High School Recommendation	- .01 .17	-.16* .20	.28 .30	.19 .22	
Graduate Drop Out	6. Grade-Point Average, Univ. of Chicago	- .40 .00*	-.28 -.06	.35 .26	.20 .30	.09 .30

* Graduates and Drop Outs show a statistically significant difference at the .01 per cent level of confidence.

+ Graduates and Drop Outs differ at the .05 per cent level of confidence.

An examination of Table III-A reveals that only three of the correlations are high enough to be regarded as significant. These are the correlations of S.A.T. verbal and mathematics scores for Drop Outs; high school grade-point average and rank in high school class for both Graduates and Drop Outs. The latter correlations are not surprising in view of the fact that class rank is predicated upon grade-point average.

Although other correlations are low, there are a few trends worth noting. For women graduates, the high school grade-point average had the highest positive correlation with University of Chicago grade-point average while S.A.T scores showed the highest negative correlation with grades at Chicago. For this group, high school recommendations carried little weight as predictors of academic success.

For women drop outs, on the other hand, high school recommendations and rank in high school class, as well as high school grade-point average showed a definite positive relationship to college grades. For this group, there was little or no relationship between S.A.T. scores and college grades.

The main significance of the results lies in the comparison between Graduates and Drop Outs. In the first place, the Drop Outs showed more consistency between S.A.T. verbal and S.A.T. mathematics scores than did the Graduates. While for Drop Outs there is a slight positive correlation between S.A.T. verbal scores and rank in high school class, for Graduates there is a slight negative relationship between these two variables, with a statistically significant difference between the two groups. Although not statistically significant, the same trend in relationship and differences between groups is shown in correlations between S.A.T. verbal scores and high school grade-point average.

While both groups showed a high positive relationship between high school grade-point average and rank in high school class, there was a significantly greater relationship between these variables for the Drop Outs than for the Graduates.

The two groups also showed a significant difference in relationship between S.A.T. mathematics scores and high school recommendations, the correlation being slightly negative for the Graduates and slightly positive for the Drop Outs.

Finally, perhaps the most significant difference between the groups occurs on comparison of S.A.T. verbal scores with University of Chicago grade-point average. While there is no relationship between the test score and grades for Drop Outs, there tends to be a notable inverse relationship between these variables for the Graduates.

For men, also, the inter-correlations tended to be low except for high school grade-point average and class rank. However, as in the case of the women, some noteworthy trends appear as shown in Table III-B.

TABLE III-B

Intercorrelations of Indices of Academic Performance for Male Graduates and Drop Outs

Group	Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Graduates Drop Outs	1. S.A.T. Verbal Score					
Graduates Drop Outs	2. S.A.T. Math Score	.39 .49				
Graduates Drop Outs	3. High School Grade-point Average	$-.34^{*}$ $-.10$	$-.45^{*}$ $-.18$			
Graduates Drop Outs	4. Rank in High School Class	$-.21^{+}$ $-.03$	$-.37^{*}$ $-.11$	.66 .67		
Graduates Drop Outs	5. High School Recommendation	$-.11^{+}$ .09	$-.22^{+}$ .02	.18 .28	.12 .19	
Graduates Drop Outs	6. Grade-point Average, Univ. of Chicago	$-.32$ $-.36$	$-.30$ $-.27$	$.37^{*}$ .08	$.25^{+}$ .07	.15 .15

* Graduates and Drop Outs show a statistically significant difference at the .01 per cent level of confidence.

+ Graduates and Drop Outs differ at the .05 per cent level of confidence.

Men in both groups show a trend toward consistency in relationship between S.A.T. verbal and mathematics scores, with drop outs showing the greater consistency. On a comparison of S.A.T. scores with other variables, the Graduates and Drop Outs differ significantly, although the correlations between variables are low for both groups. For both groups correlations of S.A.T. scores with high school grade-point averages and rank in high school class indicate a negative relationship, significantly more so for the Graduates than for the Drop Outs. Graduates also differ markedly from Drop Outs in that there is a negative relationship between their S.A.T. scores and their high school recommendations while Drop Outs show a very low order positive relationship between these variables.

It is interesting to note the same trend in the relationship between S.A.T.

scores and college grade-point average for both groups of men as exists for women graduates - namely, a negative relationship.

For men graduates, as for women graduates, the high school grade point average shows the highest positive correlation with college grade-point average, although the correlation (.37) is not high. For Drop Outs, the correlation between these variables is very low, with a significant difference showing between the two groups. The same trend and order of relationship between groups is shown in a comparison of college grade-point averages and rank in high school class.

In summary, then, let us draw a profile of the Graduate and of the Drop Out as suggested by the analysis of data on the six scholastic aptitude and performance variables.

The Graduates are persons whose high school recommendations have very little relationship to their academic performance in college. A considerable number of them, but by no means the majority, show some consistency between high school grade-point average and college grade-point average. Their rank in their high school class is even less predictive of college academic performance than their grade-point averages, although more indicative than high school recommendations. Insofar as their scores on scholastic aptitude tests are concerned, many of those scoring highest on the tests tended to be low on college grade-point average while many of their peers who scored lowest on the S.A.T. were among the graduates receiving the better grades. Similarly, there is a marked inconsistency between S.A.T. scores and high school grade-point averages for the Graduates. The Graduates show less consistency between S.A.T. verbal and mathematics scores than do the Drop Outs.

What, then, characterizes the Drop Outs? Here, as in regard to the profile on Graduates, the analysis of data can be considered only as indicating trends in relationship between variables except for the great consistency in S.A.T.

verbal and mathematics scores shown by Drop Outs. The Drop Out, then, was likely to score within a close range on S.A.T. verbal and S.A.T. mathematics measures. There was a greater possibility for this among women than among men Drop Outs.

As in the case of the Graduates, men Drop Outs receiving the higher scores on the scholastic aptitude test tended to rank low in college grade-point average. S.A.T. scores for women show little or no relationship to college grade-point average. Women Drop Outs show a rather slight consistency between high school and college grade-point averages, while for men there is very little relationship between these averages.

High school recommendations were more relevant as a predictive index of college success for women Drop Outs than for men Drop Outs, or men and women Graduates, although it should be noted that the majority of all matriculants failed to demonstrate through college grade-point average the academic competence predicted by those who recommend them.

Men and women Drop Outs did not show a marked consistency between college grade-point average and rank in high school class. However, the women showed considerably more consistency in this regard than did the men.

What, then, are the implications of these findings?

When one considers that 80% of the Graduates and 71% of the Drop Outs score within the 550-750 range on S.A.T. verbal measures and 74% of Graduates and 72% of Drop Outs on the quantitative measure, one finds the correlations of S.A.T. scores with college grade point average surprising.

Why do high school and college grade-point averages not show a high degree of relationship to S.A.T. scores? Is it possible that the unique intellectual qualities of these students have not been taken into account in curricular planning?

Are methods of instruction not adequately designed to enhance the development of intellectual potential?

Should we examine our basis for evaluation? Is it possible that the bell-shaped curve which has gained acceptance as a statistical device for describing large, heterogeneous populations has become the measuring stick, the one ruler by which all groups, however homogeneous its members be, are judged? Is there a tendency on the part of teachers simply to start with the "middling C" on the assumption that the two-thirds majority of students are appropriately thus described and that other students automatically will rate relatively higher or lower?

Could it be that the S.A.T. tests are not valid measures of the intellectual potential of highly selective students? Do they have value as indices to be used after matriculation?

From what source does a student derive a sense of himself as a learner, and hence, the self-directed motivation to develop his intellectual resources?

If the experiences of this class can be regarded in any sense as typical, and, though substantial change has taken place in the subsequent two years, many characteristics would seem to be in large measure, typical - two questions may be in order:

1. As S.A.T. scores, high school grade-point averages, recommendations, and class rank appear to be uncertain predictors of academic success at Chicago should we not consider supplementary measures as a part of our criteria for admissions selection?

2. Can the University evaluate its academic program with an eye to innovating changes which might maintain larger numbers of students in four-year programs designed to enhance the intellectual development of this highly selective group.

If the responsibility for academic proficiency rests not only with the individual student but also with the College, investigation and further study of these problems seems indicated.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Interview Groups

In order to understand the highly complex personal reasons and motivations for drop out, as well as persistence, two groups of students from the total class were selected as interview subjects.

The first Interview Group, the Graduates, were selected in March, 1963 from the list of 1959 entrants expected to graduate in June of 1963. Every fourth student on the graduation list was invited by the author to participate in the project; the general purposes of the project were explained; and the advice and help of the subjects was requested.

With almost no exceptions, this group responded enthusiastically to the invitation. The students talked candidly and expansively of their experiences at Chicago. The interviews were hand-tabulated by the author, and a report on the "Attitudes of the College of 55 Graduating Seniors" was written and circulated within the University by the author. (Three of these students subsequently did not graduate; this fact explains the discrepancy in numbers.)

In the spring of 1964 our proposal to the United States Office of Education for small contract support for a similar interview project with Drop Outs from the class was approved. A letter was sent to some 180 Drop Outs at their parental address during college residence. Approximately 150 of these were received (or not returned by the Post Office as undeliverable). From the 150 contacts, some 90 postcard responses (or personal letters) were received.

An Interview sample was constructed from the responses. Approximately 66 subjects were chosen, students whose pre-college homes were in rough geographic congruence to the geographic place of origin of the original class. Mr. Keeling, the Project Staff Interviewer, corresponded extensively with these subjects, planned his itinerary around feasible appointment schedules, and visited and interviewed some 60 subjects throughout the continental United States during the summer and early autumn of 1964.

The Interview Guide (Appendix: I, p. 89) used in these interviews was roughly similar to that used by the author in comparable interviews with the Graduates. In both sets of Interviews, the emphasis was on informality, open-ended questioning, and probing for the real reason, the nuance - rather than the surface meaning or superficial answer.

The Interview write-ups were studied extensively by the author and Dr. Orr, Project Consultant, and rating scales were created for the analysis of the Interviews. The author and Dr. Orr subsequently rated each interview independently and met to reconcile discrepancies. The interviews of the Drop Outs and Graduates were rated, prepared for computer analysis, and extensively analysed by statistical treatment as described below.

The Interview Analysis

Our detailed study of the interviews resulted in the creation of ratings to explore seven major areas of inquiry. (Appendix: II, pp. 111-143).

The first of these general areas focuses on Family/Social/ and Circumstantial factors of the pre-matriculation and post-matriculation period: family attitude towards college, factors influencing the student's selection of Chicago, the student's financial circumstances, and commuting as a factor for the student living at home.

The second general area focuses on the Personal Development of the Student as he enters college: his academic goals, his relationships with adults and with peers, and his general progress towards achieving responsible social behavior. These scales are based, in part, on the developmental task concepts of Robert J. Havighurst.[1]

The third and fourth areas include two scales devised by the author to test her hypotheses concerning personal values and personal characteristics associated with persistence and/or withdrawal. Value Scale: Items 8-12, Appendix: II pp. 118-19. Personal Characteristics Scale: Items 13-17 Appendix: II, pp. 120-121.

The Student's Expectations of College constitutes the fifth general area of inquiry and includes expectations of the curriculum, of the ethos of the College community, of relationships with faculty and other adults; expectations of fellow students, of opportunities for social relationships, and of participation in extra-curricular activities.

The sixth general area of inquiry is the College community, the College environment as the student himself perceives it and his experience with it: including the curriculum, the ethos of the college community, faculty, advisers residence staff, the students, the extra-curricular program, and residence in University dormitories, fraternities, and private apartments.

The final area of inquiry is a generally evaluative one. Two rating scales are included: the first, a judgement of basic or root cause of the student's difficulty; the second, a judgement of the appropriateness of Chicago as a college choice for the individual student.

---

[1] Havighurst, Robert J., Human Development and Education, Longmans Green, New York.

Comparison of Drop Outs and Persisters

The 60 Drop Outs and 52 Graduates interviewed differ markedly on many of the ratings designed to analyze their expectations, personal characteristics, values, and experiences as revealed in the interviews.

These differences are discussed in this Chapter. Ratings are listed by title and by number but the responses are not reproduced in the text. Responses of both Interview groups are reported in full by absolute number and by percentage in the Appendix II, pp. 111-143.

A. Family/Societal/ Circumstantial Factors

In this first area of inquiry few significant differences differentiate Drop Outs from Persisters. The scales are of interest in and of themselves, but they add relatively little to the profile of the Drop Out student.

Family Attitudes towards College (1) The majority of parents of both Persisters and Drop Outs appear to have been interested in and supportive to the idea of college in general and the choice of Chicago in particular. It may be noted that a greater number of parents of Drop Outs (18% as compared to 6%)did not favor Chicago; however, the absence of complete data for the Persister group makes final conclusions unwarranted.

College Selection: Independence of Student's Selection (2): Deciding Factor in Selection (3) Both Persisters and Drop Outs were permitted in the majority of cases (75% for Persisters; 70% for Drop Outs) to make relatively independent choices of college. In those instances where financial support, undue parental insistence, or rejection by first choice colleges unduly determined the student's choice of Chicago, there are no significant differences between the number of Persisters and Drop Outs affected.

Similarly, there seems to be little significant difference between

Persisters and Drop Outs with regard to the factor which was most decisive in their selection of Chicago. For the Drop Outs, the largest single factor was the recommendation by the peer group while for Persisters it was the general academic reputation of the University. These differences are numerically slight, however, and a great range of factors are mentioned by both groups of students as having been the major influence in their final decision.

Finances (35) Nor is financial difficulty a major cause of discrimination between Drop Outs and Persisters. 12% in both groups report that finances were a continuing burden which left the student hard-pressed, worried, often marginal in his involvement and time on campus. But for the overwhelming number of both groups, (88% for Persisters; 80% for Drop Outs) finances were not a continuing problem.

Furthermore, for even those students (8% of Drop Outs) whose withdrawal is attributable to financial difficulties - (i.e., with aid the student would have, though possibly should not have, returned) for even these students, financial difficulty can be seen only as a co-determinant of withdrawal. For these five students, for example, financial difficulty was also associated with poor grades (in every case), psychiatric difficulty (in two cases), and interest in curricula not offered at Chicago (two cases).

Thus, for the majority of students, Persisters and Drop Outs alike, the financial problem was adequately met. For 12% of both Drop Outs and Persisters, finances were a continuing struggle, and for 8% of Drop Outs financial difficulty, teamed significantly with other factors, was the precipitating trigger of withdrawal.

Commuting from Home (35) One out of ten Drop Outs and Persisters lived at home. Thus, the gross figure would not suggest that the factor of commuting in itself is descriptive of the Drop Out. It seems worth noting, however, that six of the seven Drop Outs expressed some dissatisfaction with commuting, a sense of isolation from campus, and a wish to have lived on campus had finances and family circumstances made it possible. More than half of the Persisters, on the other hand, reported themselves to be quite satisfied with the commuting arrangement.

In summary, therefore, it may be said that while these five scales are provocative and interesting in themselves they do not indicate that Family/Societal/Circumstantial factors are markedly different in their effects upon Drop Outs and Persisters.

B. Personal Development Factors (4-7)

The four ratings which focus on the individual student's personal development suggest significant contrasts between Persisters and Drop Outs. In each of these ratings, the time factor is obviously important in view of change and development during the college years. Therefore, insofar as possible, the Analysts have attempted to rate the student as of his first year or early in his college career so that these measures are, wherever possible, a reflection of the student's development prior to prolonged contact with the College environment.

Academic and Educational Goals (4). Persisters were, in the main (about 70%) strongly oriented towards specific academic fields and specific educational/vocational objectives (48%) or towards a general liberal arts education (21%). In contrast, 43% of the Drop Outs were uncertain or unspecific about academic goals and very few were oriented towards general liberal arts education.

Thus, the Drop Out group, in contrast to the Persisters, contained significantly more students whose goals were generally unspecific and uncertain and significantly fewer students strongly oriented to general liberal arts. [2]

Relationship with Adults (5) Some 40% of Persisters appeared to have achieved a mature level of emotional independence and interdependence with adults as compared to only 7% of Drop Outs. Moreover, only 25% of Persisters, as compared to 45% of Drop Outs were seen as being excessively dependent on (or excessively resistant to) help from adults. The bulk of the Persister group, in other words, showed itself to be significantly more mature than the Drop Out group with regard to expectations and quality of relationships sought with adults -faculty, advisers, parents, and others. They were very much less inclined to be inappropriately hostile towards adult authority, less inclined to be excessively dependent or resistant to adult advice, and more consistently inclined to be able to reach decisions and order their lives independently without adult prompting, while at the same time finding it possible to seek adult advice when appropriate.

Relationships with Peers (6) While almost 40% of Persisters, as compared to only 7% of Drop Outs, are rated as having reached a very competent degree of social maturity in relationships with peers, it is to be noted that an almost equivalent number of both groups (27% as compared to 30%) rate at the lowest level of maturity. Furthermore, the bulk of Drop Outs are in the middle two ranges. Thus, while significantly more Persisters than Drop Outs were unusually mature in peer relationships and while a large minority of both groups had difficulty with peer relationships, members of both groups rate variously on this scale.

In summary, however, 58% of the Persisters ranked in the first two categories as compared to 44% of the Drop Outs; while 37% of the Persisters ranked in the lower two categories as compared to 53% of the Drop Outs.

---

[2] That nearly 30% of the Graduates were similarly unspecific and uncertain about goals is a point worth noting. The similarities of Drop Outs and Persisters, apparent in many of these ratings, are significant and will be considered in detail in the concluding chapter.

Desiring and Achieving Socially Responsible Behavior (7) This rating attempts to describe the student as a community member, with regard to his view of the importance of community and social institutions.

68% of the Persisters, as compared to 18% of the Drop Outs, recognized, at least verbally and theoretically, the importance of the community, of community institutions, and or regulations. In contrast, 62% of the Drop Outs, as compared with 29% of the Persisters, were concerned primarily with themselves and their own sub-groups and showed no evidence of regarding the larger community as significant.

In summary, with regard to these four indices of socialization and personal development, it may be concluded that Drop Outs as a group rated significantly lower than did the Persisters. Drop Outs were far more likely to be unspecific, vague, or uncertain about academic goals. Over 75% of them experienced some difficulty in relating to adults - 25% indifferent or hostile to adult authority; 45% overly dependent upon or resistant to adult assistance. As a group, they rated somewhat lower than their Persister counterparts in social maturity with peers, and they were very significantly more inclined to focus on themselves and their sub-groups rather than the larger community.

In contrast, the Persister group contained fewer students whose goals were unclear, vague, or unspecific and more students strongly oriented to general liberal arts. They were significantly more mature in their expectations of and relationships with adults, somewhat more mature in their social relationships with peers, and significantly more socialized with regard to the importance of community membership, community institutions and regulations.

C. Personal Values

Hypothesizing that certain personal values might be associated with the University of Chicago community and that students sharing these values would be more likely to persist than would students with conflicting values, the author devised five ratings (8-12) as value measures. This Value Scale (Appendix: II pp.118-20) appears to be discriminatory in differentiating Drop Outs and Persisters.

Scale 9 62% of Drop Outs displayed relatively little interest in issues beyond their own personal environment and personal affairs, while 66% of the Persisters demonstrated a marked degree of commitment and concern with major social problems and current issues.

Scale 10 50% of the Drop Out group, as compared to 40% of the Persisters indicated approval and need for more structure, tradition and college customs; 44% of the Persisters as compared to only 25% of the Drop Outs preferred customs and traditions unique to Chicago. Relatively few (12% Persisters and 20% Drop Outs) indicated strong sympathy for experimentation, change, and innovation.

Scale 11 87% of Persisters, as compared to 53% of the Drop Outs placed a high value on the theoretical and intellectual, on intellectual pursuits, and on the transmission and application of knowledge. 18% of the Drop Outs, as compared to 4% of the Persisters, on the other hand, were impatient with the theoretical and abstract in preference for practical concerns.

Scale 8 The largest number in both groups of students, 65% of the Persisters and 52% of the Drop Outs were generally accepting of conventional symbols of social form and social status without placing particular value on forms of social activity conventional on most campuses. A small number of both groups expressed strong preferences for such campus institutions as football, dances, fraternities; and a sizeable number of Drop Outs were generally disinterested or critical of conventional symbols.

Scale 12 A large number of Persisters (65%) and Drop Outs (42%) stated belief in a philosophy of "live and let live" and tolerant toward individual differences. A sizeable number of Drop Outs interestingly enough, were either intolerant of "differentness" (37%) or critical of "conformity" (18%)

In rough summary, therefore, with regard to values, the Drop Out displays relatively limited interest in issues extending beyond his own personal environment and his own situation and is not conspicuously concerned with current issues and current social problems affecting the larger community. He expresses a need for more structure, more tradition, perhaps more "college atmosphere" and he may demonstrate some intolerance of "differentness" or, indeed, of "conformity." He is inclined to put relatively little value on theoretical knowledge, to value instead the transmission or application of knowledge, or to be impatient with the abstract in preference for practical concerns.

The Persister, in contrast, is likely to be interested and involved with social problems and current issues of the larger community, although he may or may not act on this interest. He is relatively satisfied with college customs and traditions which he perceives as unique to Chicago - though he may express a need for increased structure, tradition, or "college atmosphere". He, like many Drop Outs accepts conventional social forms but does not particularly value the conventional forms common to many campuses. He highly values the intellectual and theoretical and, similarly, the application or transmission of knowledge, and he has come to hold a "live and let live" philosophy towards his fellows with relatively little need for stereotyping others.

D. Personal Characteristics

Hypothesizing that certain personal characteristics might be associated with Persistence and Drop Out, the author devised five scales (13-17) as personal characteristic measures. As with the case of the Personal Values scale, certain of these measures appear to be discriminatory in differentiating Drop Outs and Persisters.

Scale 13   62% of the Drop-Outs were rated on Scale 13 as experiencing and expressing distinct needs for structure, advice, and support as opposed to 33% of the Persisters. 46% of the Persisters, compared to 5% of the Drop Outs, on the other hand, were seen as self-directed, demonstrating ability to work and act independently, to take initiative, and to seek help when realistically needed.

Scale 14   48% of the Drop Outs as compared to only 12% of Persisters possessed markedly unrealistic views of their ability, interests, and ambitions and tended to be unrealistic in their planning. In virtual reversal, 48% of the Persisters demonstrated realistic self-assessment, self-awareness and acceptance. A large middle group, 43% of Drop Outs and 40% of Persisters demonstrated some ambivalence.

Scale 15   A majority of both groups experienced some discomfort in dealing with the environment. For the Drop Out this discomfort was decidedly more marked than for the Persister. 85% of the Drop Outs and 60% of the Persisters demonstrated either extreme sensitivity (seen as radical resistance and disapproval or extreme susceptibility) to the college environment, or some ambivalence and difficulty in practicing a professed philosophy of toleration and acceptance. 42% of the Persisters, as compared to only 15% of the Drop Outs, were genuinely tolerant to and accepting of diversity and differentness in the environment and the attitudes of others.

Scale 16   47% of the Drop Outs showed marked difficulty in adjusting to diverse situations, change, and pressure as compared to 23% of the Persisters experiencing such difficulty. In contrast, 48% of the Persisters demonstrated considerable emotional flexibility and adaptability as compared to 15% of the Drop Outs.

Scale 17 Similarly, 53% of the Drop Outs as compared to 25% of the Persisters, were judged by the Analysts to be functioning with generally limited efficiency.

52% of the Persisters, on the other hand, appeared to be functioning efficiently and appropriately as compared to 15% of the Drop Outs. Some 27% of the Persisters and 32% of the Drop Outs appeared to have experienced and weathered minor emotional upsets without undue expense.

In rough summary, therefore, with regard to Personal Characteristics, the Drop Out tends to express strong need for structure and advice from others, is inclined to be unrealistic or to demonstrate marked ambivalence about his abilities, his interests and his plans. He is extremely sensitive to the environment and may experience difficulty in following a live and let live philosophy towards others even though he may profess it. He experiences stress in adjusting to diverse situations, pressures, and change and he may be seen as functioning with limited efficiency in several aspects of his life.

The Persister, in contrast, is quite strongly self-directed and is able to take the initiative in his own life as well as to seek help when realistically needed. He shows realistic self-assessment and self acceptance though he may demonstrate some ambivalence about his goals and interests. He tends to be tolerant and accepting of individuality and differentness though he may experience some difficulty and ambivalence in practicing this philosophy. He is emotionally flexible, can withstand stress and disappointment; and he functions with considerable efficiency, weathering minor crises and upsets without undue expense to himself and others.

E. Expectations of College

Students' expectations of Chicago are measured on five scales (18-23) (Appendix: II, pp.122-27) which contrast the pre-matriculation expectations of Drop Outs and Persisters. Some marked differences differentiate these expectations.

Academic Expectations (18) Clearly, Persisters, as a group, focused their expectations of Chicago on academic excellence. Over 80% of the graduating students mentioned academic excellence as their primary expectation of Chicago. 60% of the Drop Outs similarly expected a curriculum of academic excellence; but over 22% of Drop Outs believed that Chicago would be "like college in general", a natural progression from high school, and not radically different from secondary school. Thus, the general thrust of the academic expectations of the Persisters seem to be more firmly grounded in reality than does that of the Drop Outs.

Expectations of the Ethos of the College Community (19) With regard to the "geist" of Chicago, the contrast between Drop Outs and Persisters is at once apparent. Almost 40% of the Persisters had no particular expectations about the life of the College - presumably having built their pre-conceptions of college primarily on academic expectations. In contrast, the two sub-groups of Drop Outs, expected Chicago to be, on one hand, a closely knit, well organized community characterized by close personal relationships of faculty and students - the prototype of the small liberal arts college; or on the other hand, a free, unstructured atmosphere; while, in contrast, a large group of Persisters held no particular non-academic expectations.

Relationships with Adults (20) Similarity of expectations is far more meaningful than differences with regard to student expectations of the adult community. Clearly, both Persisters and Drop Outs (67% and 72%) expected the opportunity for formal and informal acquaintance and friendship with faculty. Once in residence, Drop Outs and Persisters may have had contrasting experiences with faculty, but in expectations, they are in agreement.

Expectations of Fellow Students (21) Interestingly enough, the largest sub-group of Drop Outs expected to find fellow students "like oneself and one's high school friends." Another large sub-group of Drop Outs, in common with the majority of Persisters, anticipated that Chicago students would be bright, cosmopolitan, intellectually oriented. And a moderately sizeable group anticipated finding highly diverse students including the "beat," the liberal, and the unconventional.

Ratings 19 and 21 provide evidence for interesting speculation with regard to the differences of Drop Outs and Persisters.

Persisters, on one hand, appear to cluster in two groups: one group characterized by the expectation of bright, intellectually-oriented, mature, cosmopolitan fellow students; the second group characterized by lack of expectation of anything but the academic program. Drop Outs, on the other hand, appear to cluster in two groups: one group characterized by expectations of a warm homogeneous, closely knit college community with fellow students like oneself and one's high school friends; the second group characterized by expectations of a free, open, unhampered atmosphere with minimum restriction and interestingly diverse and unconventional fellow students.

Expectations of Extra-curricular Activities (23) It is no surprise, therefore, that the virtual majority of Persisters had no defined expectation about extra-curricular activities. Drop Outs were relatively evenly divided among the several possible responses, the largest sub-group showing preference for activities in line with special personal hobbies and interests.

Expectations of Social Relations with Peers (22) In expectations of private, non-organized social life, however, a majority, (58%) of the Persisters, as compared to 10% of the Drop Outs, expected to enjoy a relatively active personal social life with friends of both sexes. The largest two sub-groups of Drop Outs expressed the expectation, as might be expected, of finding friends "like those in high school" or friends whose emphasis is placed upon individuality, individual independence, and "being oneself."

In summary, it may be said that Persisters and Drop Outs are alike, overwhelmingly, in expecting college to provide opportunity to know faculty, formally and informally.

With regard to community ethos and fellow students, Drop Outs tend to expect either, on one hand, a closely-knit, well-organized homogeneous community and fellow students much like themselves, or, on the other, a markedly free, open atmosphere with minimum restriction and fellow students who are diverse, interesting and unconventional. They tend to expect to build their social lives around friends similar to those known before or to join a clique of friends whose emphasis is placed on individuality, individual independence, and "being oneself."

The Persister, on the other hand, holds specific academic expectations of Chicago and tends to be non-committal with regard to expectations of college "geist" or extra-curricular activities. He expects Chicago students to be bright, cosmopolitan, mature, intellectually-oriented, and he expects to socialize quite actively with intellectually mature friends of both sexes.

F. The College Community as Perceived by the Student (24-34) In what ways, finally, do Drop Outs and Persisters differ in their experiences and perceptions of the College itself? As they appear to vary significantly with regard to personal development, values, characteristics, and expectations, it seems logical to expect similar differentiation with regard to experience.

The Curriculum (24) Persisters, as a group, focused their expectations of Chicago on the academic. 92% found their academic work totally or partially challenging. 48%, although profiting from much of the program, found specific courses and subject areas disappointing, bewildering, or excessively discouraging.

For 42% of the Drop Outs, in contrast, the curriculum was judged to have had little observable effect and to have made relatively little impression. Another 28% of the Drop Outs believed they had gained significantly in skills or point of view, despite academic difficulties; and 23% found some work rewarding and some work disappointing or excessively difficult.

Study Skills (25) When asked about study habits, Persisters and Drop Outs were explicit.

65% of the Persisters estimated that they had, for the most part, studied fairly regularly and seriously. 65% of the Drop Outs admitted that they had studied very little, highly erratically, or much less than their friends and fellow students.

A significant number in both groups (28% among Drop Outs and 19% among Persisters) studied regularly and conscientiously but despite good ability were seriously disappointed with their achievement. Among Drop Outs this dissatisfaction led to transfer in a number of cases. Many of these students finished elsewhere, one as a Phi Beta Kappa. Among Persisters, this dissatisfaction was a significant cause of disaffection, discouragement with self and doubts about the appropriateness of Chicago as a college choice.

Ethos of College Community (26) 55% of Drop Outs viewed the College as a generally diffuse atmosphere in which the individual student, largely on his own, falters or survives by his own efforts. Another 28% corroborated this view and augmented it by adding their impressions of impersonality, lack of structure and support. 83% of the Drop Outs, therefore, described Chicago as diffuse, impersonal, unsupportive - a taxing environment for the uncertain or immature student.

Moreover, while a small group of Persisters (13%) found Chicago a genuine community with easy opportunity for faculty-student interaction, and while a large sub-group (35%) found Chicago's open atmosphere and unlimited opportunities challenging and highly rewarding, some 52% of the Persisters corroborated the view held by the Drop Outs.

Relationships with Faculty (27) As an integral part of their College expectations, the majority of students expected opportunity to meet and know faculty members, formally and informally. Over 92% of the Drop Outs and 77% of the Persisters, however, found faculty either unavailable and uninterested or found them interested and available only to students taking the initiative. Only 19% of the Persisters and 8% of the Drop Outs viewed faculty as very interested in students, approachable, and easily available.

Although not specifically mentioned in student expectations - the term faculty member being a generic term for the academic adult to the pre-matriculant - Advisers and Residence Staff are discernable members of the adult community for the matriculant. Student views of these staff persons are in some ways similar and in important ways different from their expectations of the reactions to faculty.

20% of the Drop Outs found their advisers available and helpful while

71% perceived them as less than helpful, perfunctory, interested in the mechanics or scheduling rather than the student.

27% of the Persisters described their advisers as available and helpful, while 46% perceived the adviser as unhelpful, perfunctory, or impersonal. The 37% of Persisters for whom "No Data" is recorded expressed no explicit sentiments, positive or negative. Many of them commented that they "advised themselves" or that their advisory contacts consisted of advisory approval for schedules. This group did not, however, express strong dissatisfaction with this situation. Many seemed indifferent; a number appeared to take pride and satisfaction in their independence.

Residence Staff (29) 37% of the Drop Outs and 46% of the Persisters described the Residence Staff as generally interested in students, available and helpful; while 43% of the Drop Outs and 20% of the Persisters perceived the staff as uninterested, only superficially interested, or not available.

Fellow Students (30) Both Persisters and Drop Outs were agreed on the diverse composition of the Chicago Student body. And both groups express some ambivalence with regard to this diversity. 42% of the Persisters and 45% of the Drop Outs had "learned to live with" the diversity - appreciating or ignoring it - while socializing with their own group of friends.

37% of the Persisters and 28% of the Drop Outs, on the other hand found the diversity challenging and interesting and believed it totally worthwhile.

17% of both Persisters and Drop Outs, however, found the diversity uncongenial and were actively critical of some or many groups of students.

Residence (32,33,34) Of the 25% of Drop Outs who lived in private apartments, about half found apartment living much preferable to the residence halls and half expressed some question and ambivalence.

Similarly, of the 33% of Persisters living in private apartments, about half found apartments much preferable with the other half expressing some questions.

93% of the Persisters and Drop Outs lived at some time in University residence halls. 60% of the Persisters described the dormitories as satisfactory and enjoyable places to live, as compared to 21% expressing minor dissatisfactions. Many of this group of fourth year students were residents of the C-Group in its final year as a University residence, and their enthusiasm for passing of the traditional upper class women's residence is reflected in this measure. Some 35% of the Drop Outs described the dormitories as enjoyable and satisfactory, and 42% expressed minor dissatisfactions.

13% of both groups registered strong dissatisfactions with the residence halls as physical units.

Summary

By comparing Drop Outs with Persisters in terms of their interview responses we have tried to determine those factors which characterize the Drop Out. Before proceeding further, it seems useful to describe the Drop Out student as he emerges from this discussion.

By and large, the Drop Out does not differ substantially from his Persister friends in the choosing of a college, the attitudes of his family towards college, his financial position, or the fact of commuting from home. None of these factors, which we have termed Family/Societal/Circumstantial appear to differentiate Drop Outs from Graduates.

With regard to personal development, values and personal characteristics, expectations of college, and finally, with regard to experiences in college, however, Drop Outs do differ from Persisters in significant ways.

The Drop Out tends to be vague and uncertain about his academic/educational-vocational goals. He is in some ways immature in his expectations of, and relationships with, adults - being overly dependent on (or resistant to) adult assistance or, possibly, indifferent or hostile to adult authority. He gets along reasonably well with his peers, though less well than does the Persister, but he is inclined to be self-involved - to focus on himself and his own subgroup and not to relate himself to the larger community. His own individuality is of paramount importance and, in contrast to the Persister, he places limited significance upon being a member of a larger community or society.

In the area of personal values, the Drop Out displays limited interest in issues extending beyond his own personal environment and is not noticeably concerned with current issues and current social problems affecting the larger community. He may value and express need for structure, tradition, more "college atmosphere". And he tends to be intolerant in some cases of "conformity", or in other cases of "differentness". He is inclined to put relatively little value on the theoretical and to value instead the application of knowledge. Or, he may be impatient with the theoretical and abstract in preference for the practical.

With regard to personal characteristics, the Drop Out is not seen as self-directed but has strong need for structure and for advice. He is often unrealistic or ambivalent about his abilities, his interests, and his plans; and he is likely to be extremely sensitive to his environment, being markedly susceptible to its influences or strongly critical and resistant. He may experience difficulty in adjusting to change, pressure, and diverse situations. In sum, he is seen as functioning with limited efficiency in several areas of his life.

In his general expectations of college, the Drop Out, like the Persister, stresses the importance of close contact with faculty members. He tends to expect college to provide one of two markedly different atmospheres: on the one hand, a closely-knit, well organized , homogeneous community with close faculty-student relationships (the prototype of the small liberal arts college); or, on the other, a markedly free, open, unstructured atmosphere with little hampering restraint on the individual student. Similarly, with regard to fellow students, the Drop Out may expect them to be like himself and his school friends or to find a group of friends who place emphasis upon individuality, individual independence, and "being oneself."

Finally, then, what is the Drop Out's perception of the College community and his experience with it?

In many instances it appears that the formal curriculum has made little observable impression on him and that he has gained relatively little from it. He may believe that he gained significantly in skills or point of view despite academic difficulties; or, he may have found some work rewarding and some disappointing or excessively difficult.

Significantly, the majority of Drop Outs studied little, or studied erratically and irregularly. However, in a significant minority of instances, the Drop Out may have studied unusually regularly, conscientiously, and painstakingly with disappointing results which eventually resulted in transfer.

By and large, the Drop Out perceives the ethos of the Chicago community as diffuse, unstructured, impersonal, — an atmosphere in which the student is largely on his own to falter or survive. He finds faculty too often uninterested, unavailable, or interested and available only to those students taking the initiative.

Advisers appear to be, in his view, sometimes helpful, often less than helpful or preoccupied primarily with the mechanics of scheduling other than with the student himself. Residence Staff, to a slightly less degree, also appear to be too often disinterested or only superficially interested in students, and many Drop Outs report little contact with staff or that they viewed them as "friends, not official advisers".

The Drop Out ,like many Persisters, regards his fellow students with mixed feelings. Diversity is something with which he has had to reckon, and he may react in several different ways. One out of four Drop Outs finds the diversity challenging, exciting, and interesting; but for one out of five, the diversity is uncongenial, and the student is critical and antagonistic to some or many of his fellow students. For the most part, the Drop Out has "learned to live with" the diversity, appreciating or ignoring it while socializing with his own group of friends.

The Drop Out has enjoyed his participation in a variety of extra-curricular activities, particularly those associated with the dormitories or with his own special interests.

One of four Drop Outs has lived in a private apartment and is as likely to be enthusiastic as to be ambivalent. One of six Drop Outs has lived in a fraternity, and one of ten has commuted from home.

But for the most part, the Drop Out like the Persisters has lived in University housing and has expressed mixed reactions to the dormitories as physical units.

Who, then, is the Drop Out? Many students, many individual human beings, each unique in himself and in his circumstances, are overlooked in the generality and anonymity of statistical treatment. This fact cannot be overemphasized.

Perhaps he was a hard-working, overly conscientious physics major whose discouragement with his grades, despite long hours of work, finally led to his transfer.

Or a modest but solid political science major whose marriage to a graduate student at Cal. Tech. caused her to transfer to a West Coast school.

Perhaps he hated Chicago from the moment he arrived and transfered at Christmas, despite straight A's, to a Big Ten University.

He may well have "worked his way through," a marginal student whose work load allowed little time for study and who surrendered, ultimately and reluctantly, to the pressure of low grades, little family interest and encouragement, and a hand-to-mouth existence.

She may have been excessively dependent upon adult advice and assistance, intolerant of that perceived as "different," and highly critical of the diversity and amorphousness of the Chicago environment. Expecting Chicago to be a closely knit, well organized community with frequent opportunity for faculty-student acquaintance, she quickly condemned the reality as cold and unstructured, an atmosphere inhospitible to student success and survival. Expecting fellow students like herself and her high school friends, she quickly labeled the diverse student body as "beat," radical," and "egg head."

Or perhaps he selected Chicago as a place where he could "be himself" and find freedom from the conventional and the restricting little-mindedness of society. He was indifferent or hostile to adult authority and highly critical of that which he characterized as conformist or "square." Expecting Chicago to be free, open, and unstructured with maximum opportunity for unhamper individual expression, he readily disparaged anything which seemed to threaten or run counter to that image. He wanted no supervision or interference: yet he expressed dissatisfaction that faculty, advisers and others did not understand him or take interest in him as a person. And, in later years, he may articulately bemoan the lack of "somebody to be firm," albeit recognizing that he himself probably would not have listened at the time.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

It is true enough that averages can blur and statistics confuse; nonetheless, from the analyses of these interviews an image, or images, of the Drop Out student emerges which stands the test of common-sense and experience.

We have already seen that good academic performance and drop out seldom go together. Where they do, clearly, the student is, through personal characteristics and predilections, a proverbial "fish out of water" in the Chicago environment.

We have also seen that students who drop out (or flunk out) are not necessarily those with low or marginal ability.

It is, therefore, the author's contention that it is in this little explored area of intangibles that the explanations are to be found. The student's success or failure - his perceptions and experiences with college - will be determined by the combination or "mix" of College "geist" and his own personal development or entrance, his personal values, characteristics, and his specific expectations.

We have also seen that while there is some correlation between high school grade averages and college grade averages for graduates, there is a low correlation between high school grade averages and college grade averages (though not necessarily SATs) for Drop Outs. Is it not, therefore, reasonable to hypothesize that loss of esteem, damage to self-image, loss of face is an underlying constant in the decision of Drop Outs to withdraw? Yet, why did they not succeed. SAT evidence grants them, as a group, ability in no way inferior to that of Graduates.

In some very few cases, Drop Outs may have been handicapped by limited ability and, conscientious or not, have dropped out in realistic discouragement at the overwhelming competition.

In an important minority of cases, Drop Outs did study intensively, conscientiously, often much harder than their Persister friends - but were unable to meet their own expectations of themselves or to find appropriate curricula at Chicago. The evidence here indicates, in the author's view, the existence of a certain intellectual incompatibility on the part of this group of students to the "mystique" of college curricular organization, to the lack of articulated specificity of goals and objectives in college courses, or to the diverse requirement of skills, verbal and quantitative. Thus, these students, able and hard-working, found themselves unable to perform in the Chicago environment. One of them went on to graduate as a Phi Beta Kappa elsewhere; others achieved distinction in graduate as well as undergraduate programs.

Also, in a small minority of cases, external circumstances - health, family, marriage, etc. - dictated withdrawal or transfer which had little to do with the student or the College. (Root Cause of Difficulty: [37] Appendix: II, p. 143)

But in many cases, the evidence is clear. Despite ability, Drop Out students did not study, studied little, or studied erratically. For reasons of the unique developmental circumstances of the individual, for reasons of the incompatibility of the student and the specific Chicago environment - some negative balance in the equation of College "geist" plus the student's development, values, characteristics, and expectations - for these reasons, these students were unmotivated, unproductive, and unsuccessful. (Root Cause [37] Appendix: II, pp. 143)

Thus, finally, we pose Solomon's riddle. We have said that college succes failure depends upon the "mix" of College "geist" and student development, values, characteristics and expectations.

Where, then for each Drop Out is the negative balance?

Does it lie with the individual student? ... the College environment?

Would he have succeeded elsewhere? ... had difficulty anywhere?

In the judgements and evaluations of the Analysts, the root cause of 69% of drop outs (Scale 37: Appendix II. p. 143) was attributable to personal/emotional/developmental difficulty. A remaining 22% withdrew as a result of academic difficulty and discouragement; and circumstantial factors forced 12% of the Drop Outs to terminate.

Of this 69% judged to have major difficulty functioning and/or studying effectively, it was estimated that 20% would have had similar difficulty in any academic situation; their problems were primarily intrinsic, pressing, requiring amelioration before concentrated academic work could be undertaken. 49% were estimated, however, to have had specific difficulty functioning and studying at Chicago, their interaction with the Chicago environment itself aggravating their specific problems.

Was Chicago an appropriate college choice for Drop Outs? (38)
In the opinion of the Analysts, (Appendix, II p. 143a) it was an innapropriate choice for 74% of the Drop Outs; appropriate for 14%; the remaining 13% were seen as unable to enhance themselves in any academic situation at the time.

Interaction between the student and the college environment was viewed as an aggravant to student difficulties in slightly less than half of the 74%; in the remainder of cases it was estimated that some student goals were served but that another atmosphere might more appropriately have met the student's needs and goals.

Perhaps this verdict of mismatch of student and environment is best documented by the future educational history of the Drop Outs interviewed. (Appendix, II p. 143b) At the time of the interview, 35% had completed their undergraduate training and another 32% were enrolled in college and anticipating receiving the degree. Thus, some 67% had completed or were completing college elsewhere.

Yet, one asks, to what extent was this deferred success possible partially as the result of increased maturity, partially as outgrowth of the earlier academic experience?

It is interesting that the Drop Outs, with the exception of three or four students, were grateful for their Chicago experience and believed that they had profited from it. The judgement of "inappropriateness" is a judgement made not by the student but by the Project Analysts, in evaluation of the student and his experiences.

Being forced to face oneself, encountering infinitely broader horizons than one was prepared to meet, confronting one's personal and emotional problems, growing up - students mentioned these and many more as intangible benefits, the rewards not indicated by transcript or case record. In their eyes, often, the decision to withdraw from college was the beginning, the step backward which led ultimately forward. In the final balancing of the ledger, this intangible asset must be entered.

In the mind's eye of the author, a myriad of vignettes give dimension and life to generalities. And in the anonymity of percentages and averages produced by statistical treatment, it must not be lost to sight that each of these students was highly individual, combining characteristics in his own unique design.

Nonetheless, patterns are useful devices, helping us grasp common threads of experience which themselves possess validity. In this chapter we have described the Drop Outs, as compared with the Persister, in an attempt to isolate those qualitative, personal characteristics associated with withdrawal from College. In the next chapter we shall examine characteristics associated with various forms of the Drop Out syndrome. And in the final chapter we shall concern ourselves with implications for Educational policy of the expereinces of Drop Outs and Persisters alike.

CHAPTER FIVE

In Chapter Four we have described and contrasted Drop Outs and Persisters with regard to qualitative data from interviews with the two groups.

In this Chapter, the focus is on interviewed Drop Outs only. Our purpose is to study possible relationships between certain demographic and qualitative variables as they characterize Drop Out students in the Interview sample.

To this end, certain demographic and qualitative variables were selected as significant, and a statistical analysis of the correlations between these variables was run. The table showing the results of these correlations is reproduced in the Appendix III, p. 144.

It is possible that future analysis of this data, intercorrelations and analysis of variance, may show significant patterns beyond those reported. For this present study, however, we have selected as significant only those relationships showing a correlation of .25 or higher. It is to be noted that correlations between demographic variables and qualitative data such as this tend to be low and that some statisticians would accept correlations of a lower order than .25 as significant.

The most noteworthy differences among Drop Outs were differences associated with sex.

In respect to relations with adults, men had more positive perceptions of advisers than did women. On the other hand, they were more prone to see the faculty as uninterested in and/or unavailable to students.

Men, more than women, expected to find a college ethos characterized by a closely-knit organized community with defined mores and traditions. They were far more likely than women to perceive the College ethos as diffuse, impersonal, unstructured and lacking in integration.

The same trends along sex lines appear in regard to perceptions of fellow students - men tending to view their peers as uncongenial or with ambivalence more frequently than women. Perhaps men were more prone to this view, having shown upon college entrance less socially developed behaviors than women.

The male Drop Out, for example, was more inclined to eschew formal groups and to limit social activity to a same-sex clique or to be a "lone wolf".

Men and women Drop Outs differ, too, with regard to certain personal values and characteristics. Men tended to show less concern for social issues; while women displayed more concern on the verbal, if not participant, level of behavior. Men revealed unusually strong evidence of need for structure, tradition and customs in their environment as compared with women. Similarly, they displayed a pronounced tendency to be critical of divergency in others, while women showed much more tolerance of individual differences. Furthermore, men tended to be much more dependent upon others for advice, support and structure while at the same time showing more ambivalence about seeking help when needed.

In addition to differences associated with sex, the variable of father's occupation produced some noteworthy distinctions among Drop Outs. Students whose fathers rank in the upper echelons of Warner's Occupation Scale (professional, managerial, business executives) differ from those whose fathers are "blue-collar" workers or white collar workers of minor status in showing more ambivalence in their relations with adults. They may expect adults to be parent substitutes or they may demonstrate avoidance of, and/or hostility toward adults, with a tendency to rely on a peer clique for defense in meeting the adult world. These are the students who are inclined to expect that the faculty will be remote, requiring student initiative in establishing student-faculty relationships. In spite of the above two trends, these students also showed a tendency to be more positive in assessing their experiences with advisory staff than were students whose fathers hold occupational positions of lower rank.

Expectations and perceptions of fellow students also correlated significantly with father's occupational status. Students whose father's occupations ranked higher were prone to expect college peers to be "like themselves and their high school friends", while those with fathers of lower occupational rank tended to expect a highly diverse group of peers or to have no defined expectations. This latter group, particularly the men, were more likely to perceive peers with mixed feelings or to regard them as uncongenial.

Students whose fathers rank at the upper levels of the occupational hierarchy differed significantly from those with fathers at the lower levels in respect to the following personal values and characteristics.

They tended to be less self-directed, more inclined to hold unrealistic views of themselves, and more apt to show emotional immaturity and inability to function adequately in meeting problems. Here again, these tendencies were more pronounced in men than in women.

Students from the higher occupational groups, especially the men, were inclined to indicate that the academic program had made little impression upon them, with no evidence of change or gain accruing from their curricular experiences.

Certain of the personal development, values, and characteristics indices correlated significantly with S.A.T. scores providing the basis for the following hypothetical profile.

Drop Outs with the highest verbal scores tended to show more need for structure in their environment while at the same time showing more tolerance of other people and a "live and let live" philosophy.

A high quantitative score, on the other hand, was associated with a liking for experimentation and change and a tendency to question established authority. Drop Outs with a higher quantitative score valued divergent thinking more than those who scored low on the S.A.T. Quantitative measure. In addition, they were more socially oriented upon college entrance, much more inclined to view their college peers as congenial, and more likely to show tolerance of other people. Finally, their perception of the college ethos was that of an open atmosphere providing challenge and unlimited opportunities without hampering restrictions.

The implications attributed to these intercorrelations are provocative, interesting, and suggestive of possible avenues for further inquiry. Nonetheless, it must be remembered that the sample is small and that correlations are not high. These implications are, therefore, suggestive; but prudence dictates against drawing positive conclusions or making firm generalizations on this evidence alone.

CHAPTER SIX

Although this Study reports the case history of a college class, its underlying focus has been on Drop Out, its dimensions and its causes. The Study was undertaken to remove the facts of Drop Out from the realm of myth and to provide information as a guide to evaluating and improving educational policy and practice.

Specifically, the Objectives of the Study have been:

(a) to determine the incidence of Drop Out in the Class of 1963,

(b) to compare Drop Outs and Persisters with regard to quantitative and demographic data from University records,

(c) to compare Drop Outs and Persisters with regard to qualitative data from interviews with members of both groups,

(d) to draw conclusions on the basis of this evidence about the kinds and causes of Drop Out,

(e) to make recommendations with regard to Educational Policy and Services for students as indicated by the findings.

The results of this investigation had been described in detail above in Chapters Two and Five.

We have seen that this class is a selective population, highly talented and able; admitted from 1444 applicants, with a median score of 618 on the S.A.T. Verbal and 630 on the S.A.T. Quantitative; highly qualified by virtue of secondary school grades, class rank, and recommendations.

We have also seen that of this group of 548 entrants, in four years, 240, or 43.8% had graduated and 217 or 39.6% had withdrawn. And by the Project Terminus five years following matriculation, 309, or 56.4% had graduated, 218, or 39.8% had withdrawn, and 21, or 3.8% were still in residence.

Thus, the facts are tangible. The explanations, however, are less tangib

Through extensive study and examination of quantitative and qualitative data, we have tried to differentiate Drop Outs and Persisters, to define the several kinds of Drop Out, and to suggest the underlying factors, personal and institutional, which have worked together to cause Drop Out.

From detailed examination of characteristics differentiating Drop Outs and Persisters, we have concluded that the causes and the explanations of Drop Out lie not simply in the realm of academic ability but rather, most often, in the tension of individual and environment.

Very few Drop Outs, in this population, reflect simple lack of ability. A few Drop Outs, hard-working but relatively unsuccessful students, may reflect what we have termed "intellectual incompatibility". A few more withdrew as the result of lack of interest or change of field to curricula not offered at Chicago. And, another group is found to withdraw because of external circumstances - illness, marriage, family pressures.

But, by and large, the majority of Drop Out in this class seems to be attributable to the tension of individual and environment to what we have described as a negative valence in the equation of College "geist" plus the student's own personal development, values, characteristics, and expectations. For reasons largely personal/emotional/or developmental, the student has not been able to function and/or study effectively at this time in this specific college environment.

This broad continuum includes, of course, very diverse individuals: the socially mature, sophisticated suburbanite who decides Chicago is "not for him" and who transfers promptly to the more conventional social atmosphere of a Big Ten University .. the very able student whose personal problems overwhelm him when he is suddenly on his own to order his life and schedule his time ... or the young woman from a small, homogeneous community, who finds herself unable to accept and tolerate the diverse ideas, styles, and opinions of the student body.

The specifics differ, but the general equation underlying the specific situation remains constant.

In this report significant questions have been suggested by the description of the Drop Out student as contrasted with the Persister. In the presentation of these contrasts, however, a second highly significant phenomenon appears - substantial areas of similarity in the responses of Persisters and Drop Outs. Thus, while the contrasts of Drop Outs and Persisters on many ratings are markedly significant; so too are the many similarities of Persisters (or large sub-groups of Persisters) and Drop Outs.

For us as educators concerned with the total educational community, therefore, the problems raised by this Study are not simply the problems of Drop Out. Close observation of these ratings reveals that issues of educational policy are raised not only by the characteristics and experiences of Drop Outs but also, in many instances, by those of Persisters. In other words, in seeking to understand the factors causing Drop Out, we have been shown as well the problems of significant percentages of Persisters.

Withdrawal and transfer, therefore, do not constitute the sole focus of our concern; it includes also the discontents, unfulfilled expectations and promise, lack of realized potential of some of those who remain.

With regard to measures of Personal Development (Interview Ratings, pp. 114-117) for example, we see that 30% of Persisters are vague and unspecific about educational goals; that one-fourth of them are significantly immature in their expectations of adults and in their relationships with peers; and that some 30% are involved with themselves and their sub-groups and demonstrate littl awareness of the significance of the larger community.

Thus, on all these measures, a fourth to a third of Persisters reveal that they are not adult, independent, mature, "Fantasy Freshmen" but young people still in "process of becomming," mature in some areas - immature in others, with needs and requirements as great as those who withdraw.

If goals are uncertain, opportunity is needed to experiment with different kinds of academic fields, goals, occupational ambitions, so that wise decisions may be reached without jeopardy or penalty, not forced by the necessity of premature curricular decision.

If students have distinct needs and/or ambivalences with regard to relationships with adults, opportunity is needed for significant interaction with significant adults.

If students have not yet learned to form mature friendships or to relate themselves responsibly to the larger community, then these facts must be taken into account in evaluating the quality of life on the campus and in planning efforts to improve the residence communities and the extra-curricular fabric.

Similarly with regard to values, characteristics, and expectations, some 40% of Persisters expressed need for more environmental support, for advice and structure; over 67% expected opportunities to meet and know faculty.

Between a quarter and a third of Persisters expressed some intolerance to "differentness", some difficulty in practicing a live and let live philosophy towards others. Furthermore, a significant number were uncertain or actually unrealistic about their own abilities, their interests, their plans; and a quarter of them found it difficult to adjust to pressure and to change.

The perceptions of the College held by these young people reflects their own inability to cope with certain aspects of it and, perhaps, a touch of bitterness occasioned by unfulfilled needs and expectations. Thus, 52% of Persisters found the ethos of the College to be diffuse, or cold and impersonal. 77% viewed faculty as uninterested in students or interested and available only to students taking the initiative. And 42% expressed some ambivalence about their fellow students.

Thus, in a student body known for its openness, its maturity, its freedom, and its diversity, a significant number of students experience difficulty in meeting the expectation that they accept others; a fourth are viewed as functioning with considerable difficulty; almost half express need for more guide lines; and over two-thirds articulate a need for more meaningful interaction with adults.

If students have not yet learned to accept differentness, to appreciate diverse ideas, attitudes, people, our present melting pot approval would seem to require some careful thought and appraisal; the evidence suggests that it may actually breed intolerance or indifference in some instances.

If students have not learned to order their lives in all aspects and are bewildered by the absence of guidelines, this need should be recognized as well as the demand for freedom.

If students ask for more personal understanding from faculty and advisers, the validity and meaning of their requests needs to be understood. Is this an unassuagable cry for the "parents that never were" or is it a valid reflection of adult indifference in today's academic marketplace.

In a sense, the decision to withdraw or to remain is not necessarily a symptom of radically different impressions, experiences, or reactions; but of stronger goals, persistence, more family support or insistence, more fortunate experience with faculty. The problem posed is not specifically the problem of Drop Out; rather, it is the task of strengthening and making more meaningful the total college community.

Finally, then, what implications do these findings suggest for educational policy in general and student services in particular - given our central hypothesis that success or failure in a selective college population is determined not by simple ability but by the interaction of College "geist" and the personal qualities and expectations of the student.

Issues of significance for those concerned with policy and practice have been implicit in the earlier chapters of this Report. Here we will deal briefly with explicit recommendations for specific student services and with general recommendations.

A. Pre-Matriculation and Admissions:

We have seen that students are largely self-selective in their college choice, that the factors which determine college choice are many and varied and are as likely to be related to peer group opinion as to the functions of the high school counselor or the college admissions officer.

We have also seen that in the case of very selective populations, the typical measure of academic performance is not highly predictive of success/failure.

Perhaps most important, therefore, is the need, on the part of the college counselor in the high school and the college admissions officer to recognize the individuality of both colleges and students and to take full cognizance of this individuality in the counseling and the admission of students.

Institutions are highly individual; they have character and personality as do persons. As environments with specific individuality, they can be immensely helpful, tolerable, not helpful, or harmful, dependent upon the characteristics and expectations of the student.

It is significant that Drop Outs, as a group, were considerably less realistic about the "geist" of Chicago than were Graduates. Above and beyond the simple facts of excellence, prestige, high S.A.T. requirements and grade-point averages, the individuality of the given institution needs to be defined for prospective students.

Furthermore, it is important that prospective students know not only what the college is, but what it demands of them. Here again, the specific academic demand is only a fraction of the whole: what kinds of personal qualities are demanded? What are the qualitative, personal ingredients of success?

Finally, what are the assets and liabilities of the individual student - above and beyond S.A.T. scores and class averages. As success or failure at a highly selective college lies in the intangibles, so is it important that the student be helped to evaluate himself, his expectations, and his characteristics against the specific requirements made upon the student by the schools of his choice.

Thus, ideally, the function of college admissions officers would be to understand realistically their own institutions and to interpret them accurately and perceptively to high school counselors - thus facilitating the task of the counselor in helping students gain realistic perception of the "geist" and the ingredients for success at specific institutions.

As S.A.T. scores, class rank and recommendations appear to be uncertain predictors of success for this class, the importance of the interview as a supplementary measure is underscored. A well-conducted, skillfully designed interview in the hands of a perceptive interviewer can be a useful tool in determining supplementary clues to the intangible areas described above. Similarly, as specific characteristics and values appear to be correlated quite highly with success, the construction of a recommendation form, keyed to these factors, might be a worthwhile experiment.

B. Curriculum:

While not specifically the focus of this study, the curriculum plays so central a role in the perceptions of college students that it must be mentioned. Detailed exploration of this area was not, however, a part of the project design.

Selective students are highly academically oriented, at least to the idea if not the practice of the academic. Yet, despite this fact, it appears that many students, graduates as well as drop outs, did not study very much. Furthermore, the grade averages of the Graduates as well as the Drop Outs were not closely related to ability. And, over 40% of Persisters expressed some disappointment with phases of the curriculum.

Thus, while both students and curriculum are of undeniably high caliber, it appears that the academic program does not necessarily truly involve a number of students, Graduates as well as Drop Outs. Further exploration and discussion by students and faculty of the purposes, organization, and content of the curriculum seems clearly indicated.

C. Faculty:

Students, both Graduates and Drop Outs, commented on the general excellence of the teaching. Criticism was occasional, minimal, carping. Nonetheless, there was specific disappointment on the part of a large number of students about the lack of opportunity to meet and know faculty. Only the very independent, outgoing, self-propelled student viewed the faculty as "very available, friendly and interested in students." Many students indicated they were afraid to take the initiative with faculty, believing faculty members to be interested in talking only with the "very bright."

This, clearly, is a topic for further exploration and decision. What are the functions of faculty in a private liberal arts college in addition to classroom teaching and research: Student advising? Availability to students? Some reconciliation of expectations and reality seems indicated.

D. Advisers and Residence Staff:

The specific disappointment of some students with the apparent impersonality of their contacts with Advisers and, to a slightly less extent, with Residence Staff prompts immediate questioning about the functioning of these staff members.

A logical first reaction would raise the query as to whether certain of these staff were indifferent, mechanical, unconcerned, as some student comments would suggest. Yet, perusal of student records immediately suggests that the answer is not nearly so simple. Clearly, student records at once indicate the extent and degree of residence and advisory staff interest in students. Virtuall no student record gives witness to indifference. And in many cases, there is abundant evidence of conferences, conversations with students about personal concerns - evidence which belies student claims in great measure.

What then arethe facts in this welter of conflicting evidence?

Our students are highly academically oriented; their expectations of "adults at college" revolve around "faculty." Faculty are clearly, in student eyes, the "significant adults" of the community. Is it not possible then that for academic oriented students in a highly charged intellectual environment, non-faculty may well seem non-significant, not the meaningful adults of student expectations - not the "significant others." Thus, students may "forget" or view as unimportant their contacts with these staff people.

Ironically, the fact is that very many staff do competent, imaginative, useful work with limited credit and limited support from the academic community.

For them, indeed, there is also a problem - the problem of isolation, lack of support, lack of recognition while carrying the role, often unsung, associate with the traditional "teacher" in our society.

Yet, whether justified or not by actual performance, the problem remains that Adivsory and Residence Staff do not "get through" to students as clearly and as often as they and students would wish.

It is no solution to suggest that all tasks be filled by faculty. This is neither likely nor necessarily the solution. It is, however, highly realistic to suggest a reappraisal of the means of working together for staff, faculty and students to find a means to involve all segments of our community in the creation of a genuinely inter-operational community.

E. Residence Halls:

It is necessary to say little in this Report on this topic as much has been said elsewhere, and significant changes and improvements are in process. The enthusiasm of many Graduates for antiquated, roomy, private, non-antiseptic residences in contrast to their indifference and criticism of new, cramped noisy, sterile dormitories of recent vintage is worth noting. Obviously, students want more liveable, more appropriately designed residences which meet their needs for privacy, camaraderie, and individuality. Given these, it is the author's impression that the great majority of students would actually prefer to live in residence.

It also must be pointed out, however, that the focus of student complaint about the impersonality, bureaucracy, and lack of concern for students associated with dormitories lies in the domain of the business operation of these residences Basic questions need to be raised about the goals, objectives and purposes of student residences - and decisions in all areas brought into some congruence with these goals.

F. Formalized Extra-Curricular Activities

Interestingly enough, one aspect of life receiving very limited criticism was the area of the extra-curriculum. Some students - particularly those students seeking structure in all areas - believed the extra-curriculum to be organized inadequately and felt that the University should "do more," but the majority of students approved both of the independence of student organizations and University policy with regard to that independence. The spread of student interests over a wide range, including residence activities, is especially noteworthy.

G. Financial Aid:

Similarly, most students, Drop Outs and Persisters, appeared to be relativel well pleased with the administration of University financial aid to students.

However, the 12% of both Drop Outs and Persisters for whom finances were a continuing burden present a genuine dilemma. In none of these instances was financial difficulty the single problem; these students combined need with marginal ability, poor grades, personal and other problems. Undoubtedly, their financial situation worsened their academic and personal plights - yet, wherein lies the equitable and possible answer?

H. General Recommendations:

The most important implications of this Study for those concerned with educational policy and student services are not, in the author's view, tied to specific functionings of specific student services. They are implications at once more general and more personal in their effect on students, the total community, and all those concerned with it.

The first of these is the vital importance, documented in detail above, of a more realistic recognition of what students are and what students need.

It is our task to listen not simply to what students say but to what they mean. The treating of students as adults may be perceived as indifference by those who are not themselves, ready for it. Our expectations of students must be grounded in reality. If significant numbers of students are not - and from this evidence, indeed, they are not - mature, independent adults but young people with uneven skills "on the way to becomming" adult, then this fact must be taken into account in our planning, curricular and communal.

It is significant that the massive California riots which began as protest against administrative restriction and interference have subsequently been interpreted as protests against the lack of concern for individuals, impersonality, and the anonymity of the mass University. Student needs are not always synonomous with what they ask for.

Second, is the need to recognize that for many students college is not a community but an "experience in isolation" in which the student feels he is on his own to survive or fail, "thrown on his own resources" without familiar guide lines and with new ones not yet apparent, alone in an impersonal world "where no one cares".

That many do care, and that every student - almost without exception - encounters those who care, apparently makes little difference to his total impression. Somehow the impression persists, despite evidence to the contrary.

Somehow, the general ethos of the institution does not support the individual positive experience. Thus, the specifically helpful contact with a faculty member or an adviser is viewed as an exception to the rule rather than a component of a general impression. The specific good experience does not carry, is not remembered, or is viewed as an unusual occurrence.

The University is "they" not "we"; and through some unholy alchemy it projects impersonality, anonymity, and bureaucracy although the individuals who do its work are not impersonal, anonymous, or bureaucratic.

How, then, can we approach the task of strengthening the community, of dissolving the myths of impersonality and anonymity, of making image more congruent with reality?

The suggested need for "community" in no sense suggests a need for a homogeneous, same=culture, highly structured, sharply designed matrix. Nothing could be less congenial to most students.

What is wanted, rather, is "something to catch hold of" ... an experience, a philosophy, a model, a goal, an idea. Something around which one's experiences can be organized and made meaningful; something in terms of which one may continue to shape an identity.

What is wanted is more meaningful opportunity for interaction and acquaintance with faculty and other significant adults, more opportunity for growth through social experiences, more chance to know older students who are dealing and have dealt successfully with problems of integration and identity.

In effect, though we are far more fortunate than many institutions, our dilemma is that we participate in the national educational disease of fragmentation. Students. Faculty. Administration. Fragmented, talking and learning together all too little.

Above all, the evidence of this Study reminds us that the educational enterprise is a seamless garment which, when rent, fragmented, loses elements of its ability to fulfill its essential function, the educative function.

Through the years, the tradition of the University of Chicago has been a tradition of uncompromising excellence, restless creativity, and purposeful experimentation.

What we seek is no minor remedy, no simple improvement. Any remedy, any recommendation must involve the premise that it be the concern of the total academic community - students, faculty, administration.

What we seek is nothing less than the fashioning of a qualitatively new community, a genuine academic community which will engender and inspire inquiry, purpose, and spirit.

The Chicago tradition permits no less.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEW SURVEY OF NON-GRADUATES CLASS OF 1963

COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

I. BASIC DATA

1. Name____________________

2. Current address____________________

3. PAST INFORMATION FROM UNIVERSITY RECORDS (PRE-INTERVIEW)

Address at time of entrance____________________

CEEB Scores: V.______ Date of examination_____ Admission rating______
M.______

Other__________
Scholarship assistance: gift________ loan________ I.S.S.C.__________

Parents: Divorced separated living together deceased m.f.

highest education level m__________ f.__________

occupation m__________ f__________

High School attended______________ Average________ Rank__________

Major field at entrance__________________ or Undecided__________

Physical/Mental Health problems____________________

____

Presumed reason for Withdrawal/Dismissal____________________

Notes:

4. PRESENT INFORMATION FROM INTERVIEW

Marital Status: date of marriage ____________

living together ____________

no. of children ____________

Residence: parent's home ______ private apt. ______ other ______

Educational Status:

Currently in school ____ where ____________ full time ______

When did you resume? ____________ Present major field ____________

Will you complete a degree? ________ When ____________

or:

If not in school, do you plan to return? ____________

Where ____________ When ____________

How are you financing (will you finance) your education? ____________

Employment Status:

Presently employed ________ full time ________ part time ________

Where employed ____________ how long ________

Type of work ____________

Future career plans:

II. QUESTIONS TO BE DISCUSSED WITH STUDENTS

Under the four headings Pre-Admission, Initial Adjustment, Post-Matriculation and Withdrawal/Dismissal, several general problem areas are listed. The Interviewer is asked to probe for the student's general feelings and impressions concerning each of these problem areas. He is not expected to conduct a question-and-answer interview but a general, open-ended, depth interview; the several specific questions under each problem area are clues for the interviewer and aids to him in subsequent recording of the interview. These problem areas are the heart of the project. The Interviewer's task is to probe for the real feelings of the interviewee with regard to these several problem areas and to pursue discussing each one in the way most appropriate to the responses of the student being interviewed.

1. PRE-ADMISSION

A. Family attitudes to College in general and Chicago in particular

Did family encourage idea of College?______________________________

Did family encourage a specific College?____________________________

Was family favorable to selection of Chicago?_________________________

Did family expect particular grades, a specific major field?__________

____

Did family visit College, write frequently, take interest in grades?

B. College Counseling: How did you learn about Colleges?

High School Counselor

Catalogues:

Friends in College

Representatives of the College:

College Alumni

Other

Which information was helpful or unhelpful?___________________________

____

Which information was accurate, inaccurate?__________________________

____

What (who) actually influenced you most strongly to select Chicago?

____

____

To what colleges did you apply? (1) ______________________________

(2) ______________________________ (3) ______________________________

Which accepted you? (1) __________ (2) __________ (3) __________

Which rejected you? (1) __________ (2) __________ (3) __________

Did scholarship aid influence your decision? ________ How? ______________

____

C. Expectations of College:

What were your general academic and non-academic expectations of Chicago? Discuss:

Did you know much about Chicago before you came? ______________________

____

From what sources:

Family ____

Chicago students ____

College representatives ____

Others ____

Had you visited the campus? ______________________________________

Did you know much about the curriculum: ____________________________

General Education requirements ____________________________________

____

Electives ____

____

Discussion Method ____

____

Faculty ____

____

What did you expect of "college life"?

A residential college with social activities revolving around the Houses?

____

____

Formalized social life - dances, mixers, dating etc?_______________

____

Did you plan participation in extra-curricular organizations?_________

____

What kinds of people did you expect to meet?____________________

____

Did you have any notions about the "general atmosphere" you would find?

SUMMARY QUESTION: At the end of this Pre-Admissions area, the Interviewer should sum up and reflect the summation to the student for correction and general "feeling tone" response. (for example: "In general then, you would say that you knew _________ about the College; you selected it primarily because of _________; your family was more or less _________; and you really expected Chicago to be _________.")[1]

---

[1] Such "summary reflection" questions should be used by the Interviewer at the end of each general area of questioning.

2. INITIAL ADJUSTMENT

Did you live at home or on campus during Orientation?

What were your first reactions to College? Enthusiasm, Relief at being "out-from-under" and being away from home, fear of competition, enjoyment of being on your own, Anxiety about Placement tests, Self-Confidence, Numbness?

What (who) was helpful:

Your Adviser

Your House Head

Your family

Other students

What (who) might have helped?

In general, how do you look back upon this period? Was it a necessary evil, a useful time, fun and full of new experiences, chaotic and confusing?

Do you think it was a significant time in developing your attitude to the College? In making friends?

3. POST-MATRICULATION

A. Academic Program: Major field, Course Work

As you remember, did you select a major field before entering College or were you undecided?

Was this a strong commitment?______________________________

A transient interest? ______________________________

Did you (change/consider changing) your major field?______________

To what a.______________________________

b.______________________________

c.______________________________

Why did you make the change?

discouragement with courses____________________

change of interest________________________

other:

What course(s) did you find most difficult____________________

__________________________ Why?__________________

____

the easiest ______________________________

most disappointing __________________________

most rewarding____________________________

Did you study? ____________________ Really?? ______________

how much per day, on the average

more or less than your friends?

Now, as you look back on it, are there skills or special kinds of knowledge that you presently value which you attribute to your course work at Chicago?

B. Faculty

Did you get acquainted with any members of the faculty?

How?
Residence Hall
Class-room
Conferences
Other

Were you entertained in a faculty home? How often?

Did the faculty seem approachable?

Who took the initiative in talking with faculty--you? they?

Was the kind of teaching what you had expected of the College in:

General Education courses?

Specialization?

C. Advisory System:

Did you see your adviser often?

How often? first year____________________________________

second year____________________________________

Who took the initiative, you or the adviser?

Was your adviser helpful?

Was your adviser not helpful?

How could the Advisory system have been more helpful?

D. Student Health Service

What were your general impressions of the Student Health Service? Why? (If student had psychiatric or psychological counseling, Interviewer will introduce queries as appropriate.)

E. Finances

Did you have financial aid?___________ loan________gift_________

first year__________________ second year_______________________

a job___________ what type_______________________________________

how many hours?____

Did it interfere with your academic work?

Did you work in the summer?

How much financial planning did you do before College?

Was your estimate of the financial problem accurate?

Was money a problem, by and large?

F. Residence

Where did you live while in College?

first year
second year
third year

General attitudes to Residence Hall (friendly, noisy, drab, impersonal, a satisfactory place to live, impossible)

Did you know your House Head?

Assistant?

Did you have much contact with them?

Were they helpful to you in any way?

What functions did the staff perform?

Should such jobs exist?

As is?

With useful changes?

What kinds of people should be on the Housing Staff?

Did your House have any activities?

Did you take part? (attend, serve on House Council, or just have informal acquaintances with other students?)

Should the University have residence halls or not?

How could they be improved?

or/and

General Attitudes to Fraternity Living:

Rewards?

What were you looking for?

Did you find it?

Function at University of Chicago

or/and

General Attitudes to Apartment Living:

Why did you move out?

Time spent on cooking, etc?

Would you recommend it to others?

Would you do it again?

or/and

General Attitudes to Living at home:

How did you commute?_______________ Time per day_______________

Would you have preferred to live on campus?_______________

____

Were your friends at home or on campus?_______________

____

Where did you spend most of your leisure time?_______________

____

Did you feel out of things?

Would you do it again, financial considerations aside?

G. Fellow Students

How would you describe or characterize Chicago students?

Were these students what you had expected to find at College?

Did you find (them/some) congenial?

In general, what was your reaction to your fellow students:
(enjoy, dislike, tolerate, learn to live with the diverse
kinds of students?)

Did you have a few close friends?

A number of friends and acquaintances?

Feel distinctly lonely and out of place?

Too busy to get acquainted?

Did you date one person? a number of people at once?

Primarily informal dating, coffee dates, etc.?

Primarily formal dates?

Did you date someone at home or off-campus?

By and large, what was your reaction to the social life at UC?
(Informal and "just right", lacking, O.K. for some; not for you,
behavior much too loose, or did you miss "football and mixers")

H. Extra-curricular Activities

Had you been active in extra-curricular life in High School?__________
what activities?

Did you expect to continue them at College?
or were you bored with it?

Was the UC extra-curriculum what you had expected?______ different_____
How?

Did you participate? ________ In what?

Political affairs______ Student Government________ CORE________

Residence affairs_______Fraternity/Club ________ Debate______

Maroon_______________ Literary—Review________ Phoenix______

Athletics_____________ Religious Groups________ Other________

____

____

Did you find them rewarding or frustrating? How?

In retrospect, what activities do you wish you had gone out for?

If you didn't participate, why not?
(Lack of interest, lack of time, disrespect for the organisations?)

Do you think the College and University should follow any particular policy with regard to the extra-curriculum? (Reorganise it, leave it alone, encourage students to participate)

4. WITHDRAWAL AND DISMISSAL

What was your last quarter of residence?

Had you considered withdrawing before that time? when? why?
What factors made you stay?

What was your family's reaction to withdrawing?

As you look back on it, why did you withdraw? What were the real reasons involved, the real factors operating?

Should you have stayed?

Could or should (something/someone) have altered this decision at the time?

or

(For the student who was dismissed)

As you look back on it, what were the real causes of your difficulties?

Could (something/someone) have altered this while you were here? How? What?

Basically, in retrospect, to what do you contribute the cause of your difficulty with College?
(inadequate information about colleges, lack of family support and and interest, the wrong college, disappointment with your grades, other?)

Would you attend Chicago again? How differently?

Would you attend college again? where?____________________ why?

Would you recommend Chicago to a younger brother or sister?

All in all, did you gain or lose from your experience?

Did it serve a purpose?

Did it create more problems?

What changes would you wish to see in the College?

5. EXPERIENCE SINCE LEAVING CHICAGO

What have you done since leaving Chicago?

Have your attitudes and feelings about your experience at Chicago changed significantly during the time since you left the University? How? Why?

Have you as a person changed significantly since leaving the University? How? Why?

- -

Interviewer's Comments:

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

APPENDIX II

1.

Family Attitudes toward College

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
31	60	1. Interested in and supportive to idea of college in general; favored choice of Chicago.	40	67
3	6	2. Interested in college in general; did not favor choice of Chicago.	11	18
1	2	3. Indifferent to college in general; indifferent to choice of college.	5	8
0	0	4. Opposed or not sympathetic to idea of college in general; very little support - emotional, financial, etc. - given to student.	2	3
17	33	5. No data.	2	3
	*			*
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

* Note: All percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

2.

College Selection: Independence of Student's Selection of College

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
39	75	1. Student permitted to make relatively independent choice of college without undue influence of parental or practical pressures.	42	70
4	8	2. Family influence exerted to an unusual degree to force student's choice of school.	5	8
1	2	3. Financial aid influenced student's decision to an unusual degree.	4	7
8	15	4. Rejection by another college the precipitating factor in student's choice of Chicago.	9	15
0	0	5. Not relevant.	0	0
0	0	6. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

3.

College Selection: Deciding Factor in Student's Selection of Chicago

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
10	19	1. General academic reputation of Chicago.	4	7
5	10	2. Academic reputation in specific fields.	9	15
2	4	3. Reputation of Chicago for freedom, openness, lack of restriction and traditionalism.	7	12
10	19	4. Recommendation by high school counselor and/or teacher.	6	10
4	8	5. Location of Chicago.	8	13
3	6	6. Recommendation by U.C. admissions representative.	3	5
1	2	7. U.C. catalogues/brochures.	0	0
1	2	8. Information about Chicago in textbooks, references, magazines, press, etc.	0	0
8	15	9. Recommendation by friends among peers.	12	20
8	15	0. Recommendation by alumni (can include family).	7	12
0	0	- Recommendation by family.	1	1
0	0	☆ Early entrant program.	3	5
52		TOTAL TOTAL	60	

Personal Development: Student's Orientation to Academic and Educational Goals

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
11	21	1. Student strongly oriented toward general liberal arts education.	4	7
25	48	2. Student strongly oriented to a specific academic field or to a specific vocational/educational objective (e.g., medicine, law, etc.).	28	47
1	2	3. Student has generalized goal to "getting diploma" - a college degree.	2	3
15	29	4. Student's goals are unspecified, vague, or non-existent.	26	43
0	0	5. No information	0	0
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

5.

Personal Development: Relationship with Adults

Persisters				Drop Outs	
No.	%			No.	%
21	40	1.	Student has emotionally independent relationship with parents. Establishes inter-dependent relationships with adults (faculty, house heads, etc.). Meets failure with rational efforts and without undue dependence upon parents or parent-surrogates. Student makes independent decisions and utilizes resources available to him. Does school assignments without adult prompting and supervision.	4	7
11	21	2.	Student shows some resistence to parental advice and suggestion but accepts advice and support at times. May seek help of adults when needed but is not consistently engaged in working with adults on a common task. Student alternates in showing independence of and dependence upon adults.	12	20
13	25	3.	Constantly seeks help from parents and other adults in making decisions and carrying out activities. Expects adults to be parent-substitutes. Student undecisive about goals and means of implementing goals and may show undue dependence upon adults. or: May avoid adults and show timidity and resistence to seeking help when needed.	27	45
5	10	4.	Student spends much time with a peer clique that regards itself as indifferent or hostile to adult authority. Student unduly dependent upon opinions and codes of clique as guides for decision-making and does not expect help from (nor seek it on his own) adult authority. Student tends to project blame for problems on adult authority and/or institutions.	15	25
2	4	5.	No information or not relevant.	2	3
52		TOTAL	TOTAL	60	

6.

Personal Development: Relationships with Peers

Persisters				Drop Outs	
No.	%			No.	%
19	37	1.	Student has a number of mutual friends of both sexes, participates in one or more informal, mixed-sex group activities. Student is a respected member of at least one informal same-sex clique and possibly two or more formal groups. Student dates and has several dates with one person.	4	7
14	21	2.	Student has one or more mutual friends of both sexes and is a member of a same-sex clique. Student participates occasionally in mixed-sex informal groups and participates as a member of one or more formal group selected on the basis of interest. Student has occasional informal dates.	22	37
5	10	3.	Student has one mutual friend of the same sex and spends most of his leisure time with one same-sex clique. Seldom or never participates in mixed-sex informal group activity. Student shows no enthusiasm for formal group participation although he may be a member of one group (follower). Student has single dates infrequently or does not date.	15	25
14	27	4.	Student spends undue proportion of time with same-sex clique in informal activities. Eschews formal group activities and seldom or never dates. Or: Student spends most of his time in steady, dependent relationship with one person. Not involved with same-sex clique or with other students significantly. Or: Student is a Lone Wolf and has no close friends of either sex. Is not a member of a formal or informal group, except possibly one group highly related to an interest, motivated by the activity rather than by the inter-personal relationships.	1	2
0	0	5.	No data or not relevant.	0	0
52		TOTAL	TOTAL	60	

7.

Personal Development: Desiring and Achieving Socially Responsible Behavior

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
18	35	1. Student thinks and speaks of himself as a member of the student body or a community-based organization and is an active member of at least one such organization. Student sees importance of community institutions and of laws, customs, and regulations. He places value upon demonstrating democratic attitudes in interaction with all groups and accepts his identity as a member of various social/religious groups.	6	10
17	33	2. Student thinks of himself as a member of the student body in name only and is not identified with community-based organizations in any active sense. He is uncritical about and only mildly concerned with social and political institutions and laws and regulations. He states a belief in democratic practices but may tend to practice them only in relation to his own group. May express some feeling of discomfort in socio-economic religious, ethnic, regional or political status. Or he may ignore or over-react to others outside his own group.	11	18
15	29	3. Student shows no evidence of regarding community as significant and thinks of himself as an individual rather than a member of the community. His loyalty is to a small sub-group of peers and the codes and attitudes developed by this group. He avoids interaction with individuals and groups perceived to be different, and he may be suspicious of those in authority.	37	62
1	2	4. The student shows hostility towards social and political institutions and their authorities. He identifies with a sub-group of an essentially anti-social character and sees himself as opposing established institutions. He accepts those of other religious, racial, etc. groups only if they are members of his own sub-group or if he can identify them in some way with his own cause.	5	8
1	0	5. No data or not relevant.	1	2
52	TOTAL	TOTAL	60	

Value Scale

8.

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
10	19	1. Student is disinterested in conventional symbols of social prestige, status, and social form.	20	33
34	65	2. Student accepts conventional symbols of social status and social form operating in society but does not place particular value in the kind of social activity which is conventional on most campuses.	31	52
8	15	3. Student has strong conventional interests in social forms (football, dances, fraternities, etc.)	8	13
0	0	4. No data.	1	2
52		TOTAL	60	

9.

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
15	29	1. Student has high degree of commitment and concern with social problems and current issues.	2	3
19	37	2. Student expresses a verbal concern about some major social problems and current issues but is not actively committed to dealing with issues.	15	25
16	31	3. Student displays little interest in issues which extend beyond his own personal environment.	37	62
2	4	4. No data.	6	10
52		TOTAL	60	

10.

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
6	12	1. Student shows distrust of established authority, regulations, and college traditions and expresses	12	20

10. Cont.

		strong sympathy for experimentation, change, and questioning.		
23	44	2. Student expresses a need for college customs and traditions seen as unique to Chicago and "unlike" Big Ten or other schools.	12	20
21	44	3. Student expresses approval of and/or need for structure, tradition, customs and some "college atmosphere."	30	50
2	4	4. No data.	3	5
52		TOTAL	60	

11.

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
18	35	1. Student places high premium on intellectualism, academic detachment, and theoretical knowledge.	9	15
27	52	2. Student values intellectual pursuits and places emphasis upon the transmission or application of knowledge.	23	38
2	4	3. Student places high premium on practical concerns and may be impatient with the theoretical or abstract.	11	18
5	10	4. No data.	17	28
52		TOTAL	60	

12.

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
5	10	1. Student values divergent thinking and diversity in others and himself and may lack tolerance of convergent thinking and conformity.	11	18
34	65	2. Student holds a "live and let live" philosophy. He is tolerant of individual differences without need for criticism or uncritical approval of the values of others.	25	42
12	23	3. Student demonstrates intolerance, dislike of, or indifference to differentness. He may tend to "type" people, and he may adhere quite rigidly to belief in a single moral/religious/ethical code.	22	37
1	2	4. No Data.	2	3
52		TOTAL	60	

Personal Characteristics Scale

13.

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
24	46	1. Student is self-directed. He has the ability to work and act independently, to take initiative, to live his own life, to act appropriately despite distractions, and to seek help when realistically needed.	3	5
11	21	2. Student shows responsibility in making decisions and acting independently in certain areas of his life, although still quite dependent upon parents, other adults, and peers for guidance in other areas of his life.	18	30
17	33	3. Student has expressed need for clear structures, advice, and support. He may be constantly dependent on others or show inability to seek help when needed.	37	62
0	0	4. No data.	2	3
52		TOTAL	60	

14.

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
25	48	1. Student shows realistic self-assessment, self-awareness, and self-acceptance.	5	8
21	40	2. Student shows some ambivalence about how he thinks and feels about his abilities, interests, goals, etc.	26	43
6	12	3. Student has unrealistic views of his ability, interests ambitions, and desires. He may be unrealistic in his planning or withdraw and avoid coming to grips with himself and his situation.	29	48
0	0	4. No Data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	60	

15.

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
22	42	1. Student demonstrates tolerance to and acceptance of individuality, diversity, and differentness in the environment and in the attitudes of others.	9	15
15	29	2. Student shows acceptance of diversity by a "live and let live" attitude but he may experience difficulty in practicing this attitude. May choose to ignore others, keep to himself, or to his own sub-group only.	30	50
15	29	3. Student demonstrates extreme sensitivity to the environment and to the attitudes of others. He may indicate radical resistance and disapproval _or_ extreme susceptibility to environment and attitudes.	21	35
0	0	4. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

16.

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
25	48	1. Student shows emotional flexibility and adaptability. He can withstand stress, change, disappointment without undue penalty.	9	15
15	29	2. Student finds difficulty in adapting to some disappointments. He tends to suffer anxiety during stress situations but manages most everyday situations with a modicum of adjustability.	22	37
12	23	3. Student finds extreme difficulty in adjusting to diverse situations, pressures, change, and disappointments. He may demonstrate rigidity, withdrawal, inability to cope, etc.	28	47
0	0	4. No data.	1	2
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

17.

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
25	48	1. Student appears to have general emotional health and to be free, by and large, to function adequately and appropriately.	9	15
14	27	2. Student has minor emotional upsets or crises but manages to weather these with some balance and without undue emotional expense to himself and others.	19	32
13	25	3. Student suffers from pronounced immaturity, instability, crippling conflicts, depression, or general inability to function adequately.	32	53
0	0	4. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL TOTAL	60	

18.

Expectations: Academic

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
21	40	1. Expected rigorous academic program with considerable specificity of detail: e.g., general education, discussion method, serious intellectual atmosphere, competitive mature students.	11	18
22	42	2. Expected a generally rigorous academic program with few specific additional expectations.	25	42
0	0	3. Expected good training in special field - no additional explicit expectations.	2	3
2	4	4. Expected Chicago to be like "college in general" - a natural progression from high school and not radically different.	13	22
7	13	5. No specific expectations.	9	15
0	0	6. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	60	

19.

Expectations: Ethos of College Community

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
10	19	1. Closely knit, well organized community, characterized by close personal relationships of students and faculty. An integrated academic and social organism, with formalized, organized extra-curricular programs, and fairly well defined mores and traditions.	19	32
13	25	2. Some community organization - but not a "social" school; primarily academically and intellectually oriented institution.	18	30
10	19	3. A free, open unstructured atmosphere allowing students maximum opportunity for unhampered individual expression and experience. Few regulations, little formalized extra-curricular life, the initiative remaining with the individual.	18	30
19	37	4. No expectations.	5	8
0	0	5. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	60	

20.

Expectations: Relationships with Adult Community

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
35	67	1. Opportunities for frequent contact - formal and informal - with interested faculty and other quasi-academic advisers.	43	72
10	19	2. Faculty interested in students· available for consultation to students taking initiative.	11	18
0	0	3. Faculty primarily research-oriented, unavailable; little interest in students.	0	0
7	13	4. No data.	6	10
52		TOTAL	60	

21.

Expectations: Fellow Students

Persisters No	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
6	12	1. Student expected U.C. students to be "like oneself and like high school friends."	21	35
3	6	2. Student expected U.C. students to be "very different from high school associates.	5	8
27	52	3. Student expected U.C. students to be bright, cosmopolitan, mature, intellectually oriented people.	20	33
3	6	4. Student expected many kinds of individuals from widely differing backgrounds - a highly diverse group including liberals, "beats", and the unconventional.	10	17
13	25	5. No special expectations.	4	7
0	0	6. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

22.

Expectations: Opportunities for Social Relations with Peers

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
30	58	1. Student expected to date very frequently or steadily and to become part of a same-sex clique. Student expected to have many friends of varied backgrounds seen as more socially and intellectually mature than majority of high school friends and more interested in intellectual-aesthethic values and activities.	6	10
1	2	2. Student expected to find friends much like those in high school, to become a member of a homogeneous same-sex clique, and to date frequently. He expected considerable informal social activity not related to intellectual prusuits. He may have expected to join a fraternity.	21	35
4	8	3. Student expected to find a group of friends whose emphasis is placed upon individuality, individual independence, and non-conforming ideals and social and/or political values. Student highly values "being himself" and "validating" himself and his experiences in his social relationships.	16	27
7	13	4. Student expected to devote himself primarily to his studies and to involve himslef sparingly and secondarily in social interaction.	7	12
10	19	5. Student had no defined expectations.	10	17
0	0	6. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

23.

Expectations: Extra-Curricular Activities

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
17	33	1. Student expected active community life and planned to play a fairly active role in the life and the community.	13	22
10	19	2. Student planned to take part, if time permitted, in specific activities in line with his special interests. He shows no special concerns or interests in total community life.	19	32
0	0	3. Student shows no expectations and/or interest in participating in extra-curricular organizations.	14	23
25	48	4. Student has no defined expectations.	0	0
0	0	5. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL		
		TOTAL	60	

36.

Student's Perceptions: The Curriculum

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
25	48	1. Student found total program to be, for the most part, challenging and rewarding.	4	7
23	44	2. Student profited from work in specilization and/or congenial fields; found work in some areas frustrating difficult, or disappointing.	14	23
0	0	3. Despite difficulty with various aspects of formal work, student feels he "learned to think" and to express himself coherently and/or broadened his intellectual horizons.	17	28
4	8	4. Academic program made little impression on student; no observable change or gain.	25	42
0	0	5. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	60	

25.

Student's Perceptions: Study Skills

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
34	65	1. Student studied regularly and seriously; accomplished to his satisfaction.	3	5
10	19	2. Student studied regularly and seriously; very dissatisfied with his achievements.	17	28
8	15	3. Student studied very little or erratically.	39	65
0	0	4. Student felt "blocked" in studying.	1	2
0	0	5. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	60	

Student's Perceptions: Ethos of College Community

Persisters				Drop Outs	
No.	%			No.	%
7	13	1.	A genuine community with recognizable mores and traditions, opportunity for interaction with fellow students and faculty, and opportunity for participation in extra-curricular, community life.	1	2
18	35	2.	An open atmosphere where individual has unlimited opportunities for acquaintances with faculty and students and for following his own extra-curricular interests without spoon-feeding and restrictive regulations.	9	15
6	12	3.	A generally diffuse atmosphere in which individual is largely on his own and can develop as he wishes by his own initiative. Can be an excellent atmosphere for the mature; difficult for the immature.	33	55
21	40	4.	A cold, impersonal unstructured place characterized by 'sink-or'swim' attitudes; each student on his own; little opportunity to meet faculty and students. Absence of recognizable standards and traditions aan make it difficult for student to maintain himself.	17	28
52			TOTAL TOTAL	60	

27.

Student's Perceptions: Relationships with Faculty

Persisters				Drop Outs	
No.	%			No.	%
10	19	1.	Faculty very interested in students; approachable and easily available. Student invited to faculty home, etc.	5	8
19	37	2.	Faculty interested in students and available to students taking initiative.	30	50
21	40	3.	Faculty interested in own affairs, unavailable and/or disinterested.	25	42
2	4	4.	No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	TOTAL	60	

28.

Student's Perceptions: Relationships with Advisory Staff

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
14	27	1. Student found adviser available and helpful.	12	20
12	23	2. Student found adviser available but unhelpful or perfunctory or interested in mechanics only.	29	48
0	0	3. Student had good experience with his adviser - but believes most students did not. System generally not adequate.	2	3
7	13	4. Student found adviser difficult to see, disinterested, and/or not helpful.	16	27
19	37	5. No data.	1	2
52		TOTAL	60	

29.

Student's Perceptions: Residence Halls Staff

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
24	46	1. Student found residence staff, by and large, interested in students, available, and generally helpful.	22	37
7	13	2. Student found great variation among staff members; some very helpful; others not.	6	10
5	10	3. Student felt residence staff to be, by and large, not helpful, disinterested, or superficially interested.	24	40
5	10	4. Student felt staff job to be important, and in need of modifications and alternations to be more effective and useful.	2	3
3	6	5. Student did not live in residence hall.	4	7
8	15	6. No data.	2	3
52		TOTAL	60	

30.

Student's Perceptions: Fellow Students

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
0	0	1 Views them as very congenial: similar to high school friends.	1	2
19	37	2. Views them as very congengenial: highly diverse groups - different and challenging to know.	17	28
2	4	3. Views them as uncongenial: diversity of groups troubling.	4	7
9	17	4. Views them as uncongenial: finds students "immature," "beat," generally unattractive, radical, etc.	10	17
22	42	5. Mixed feelings: Student has his own group of friends and, by and large, has learned to appreciate/ignore/ or accept the diversity but with some ambivalence.	27	45
0	0	6. No data.	1	2
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

31.

Student's Perceptions: Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
5	10	1. Student participated in and enjoyed formalized extra-curricular activities on campus-wide scale (e.g., S.G., Maroon, O-Board, Maroon Key, etc.)	0	0
0	0	2. Did not find profitable.	0	0
1	2	3. Student participated in and enjoyed organizations associated with special interests (e.g., orchestra, choir, debate, athletics, theatre, radio, etc.)	20	33
0	0	4. Did not find profitable.	1	2
16	31	5. Student participated in and enjoyed residence halls activities and social life.	8	13
0	0	6. Did not find profitable.	0	0
4	8	7. Sudent participated in and enjoyed fraternity/women's club activities and social life.	3	5
1	2	8. Did not find profitable.	0	0
5	10	9. Student participated in and enjoyed two or more of the activities above.	11	18
9	17	0. Student viewed the extra-curriculum as unintegrated or inadequately organized.	6	10
6	12	☆. Did not participate; not interested in extra-curricular activities.	10	17
2	4	- No data.	0	0
3	6	* Served on Residence Halls Staff; found experience rewarding and worthwhile.	1	2
52		TOTAL / TOTAL	60	

32.

Student's Perceptions: Residence in University Dormitories

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
31	60	1. Student found University residence halls a comfortable and satisfactory place to live; enjoyed house activities, cultural programs, general style of life, and opportunity to know many students.	21	35
1	2	2. Student enjoyed residence halls as a social entity (opportunity to engage in activities and to meet students but found physical aspects (food, rooms, noise, etc.) a problem.	2	3
1	2	3. Student found residence halls a convenient and satisfactory physical accommodation, but disliked living with a large group of people with consequent pressures and loss of privacy.	1	2
9	17	4. Student found dorms reasonably satisfactory and acceptable. Had some reservations about either physical or social aspects of residence hall life.	22	37
7	13	5. Student found aspects of dormitory life strongly objectionable.	8	13
0	0	6. Student found dormitory life unduly restrictive because of excessive regulations of hours, social life, etc.	2	3
2	4	7. Student did not live in University residence halls.	4	7
1	2	8. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL TOTAL	60	

33.

Student's Perceptions: Residence in Fraternities

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
4	8	1. In moving to a fraternity, student looked for and found more comfortable living conditions, increased personal freedom, more congenial fellowship and friendship, more structured and organized social activity.	8	13
0	0	2. Student moved to fraternity primarily because friends did so.	1	2
0	0	3. Student moved to fraternity to get out of dormitories.	0	0
1	2	4. Student disappointed in fraternity living.	0	0
47	90	5. Student did not live in fraternity.	51	85
0	0	6. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	60	

34.

Student's Perceptions: Residence in Private Apartment

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
8	15	1. Student found apratment residence much preferable to residence hall.	7	12
2	4	2. Student found apartment residence less satisfactory than residence hall.	3	5
5	10	3. Student has mixed feeling: apartment residence satisfactory but difficult for reasons of time, isolation from campus, etc.	2	3
2	4	4. Student found apartment living presents problems and/or requires considerable maturity: would not necessarily do it again or recommend to everyone.	3	5
35	67	5. Student did not live in apartment.	45	75
0	0	6. Student found apartment cheaper. Lived there for financial reasons.	0	0
0	0	7. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL	60	

35.

Student's Perceptions: Commuting from Home

Persisters No.	Persisters %		Drop Outs No.	Drop Outs %
1	2	1. Student lived at home by preference; found it a satisfactory arrangement.	1	2
0	0	2. Student lived at home by preference: regrets having done so and felt isolated from U.C. community.	1	2
2	4	3. Studant lived at home for financial or family reasons would much prefer to have lived on campus.	5	8
47	90	5. Did not live at home.	53	88
0	0	6. No data.	0	0
52	TOTAL	TOTAL	60	

Student's Perceptions: Finances

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
21	40	1. Student's family able to meet his financial needs. No real financial problems.	27	45
25	48	2. Student reliant upon family and other financial resources (scholarship, loan, work). These, combined, were reasonably satisfactory in meeting financial obligations.	21	35
6	12	3. Support from family minimal. Student mainly dependent upon scholarship, loan, and work. Felt financially pressed and had trouble meeting financial obligations. Student found finances a continuing burden.	7	12
0	0	4. Virtually no financial support (or none) from family. Student largely dependent upon outside resources (loans, scholarships) and work. Financing education seen as the major cause of drop-out.	5	8
0	0	5. No data.	0	0
52		TOTAL TOTAL	60	

Evaluative Scales: Root Cause of Difficulty

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
		1. Academic difficulty or discouragement: student unable to meet own or College academic standards.	13	22
		2. Personal/emotional/or developmental difficulty: student probably unable to function and/or study effectively in college generally.	12	20
		3. Personal/emotional or developmental difficulty: student unable to function and/or study effectively at U.C.	28	49
		4. Circumstantial or practical difficulties (family problems, illness, finances, etc.): student forced by external circumstances to terminate or interrupt college.	7	12
		5. No data.		
21	40	6. Student apparently experienced minimum academic/personal difficulty and made steady progress towards degree.		
8	15	7. Student suffered academic difficulty or discouragement but weathered it and received his degree.		
10	19	8. Student suffered minor personal/emotional/or developmental difficulties but overcame them (or despite them) was able to graduate.		
13	25	9. Student suffered fairly serious personal/emotional/or developmental difficulties but perservered to the degree.		
		0. Student experienced serious circumstantial or practical difficulties (family, illness, finances, etc.) but persisted to the degree despite serious obstacles.		
52		TOTAL TOTAL	60	

Evaluative Scales: Appropriateness of Selection of Chicago

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
31	60	1. U.C. an appropriate choice of school: student able to maintain and enhance himself in Chicago environment.	4	7
0	0	2. U.C. an appropriate choice of school: student unable to enhance himself in environment but profited from experience with the environment and valued aspects of the experience in retrospect.	4	7
10	19	3. U.C. an inappropriate choice of school: student able to reach some goals and objectives but probably would have enhanced himself more satisfactorily in another educational milieu.	25	42
2	4	4. U.C. an inappropriate choice of school: environment detrimental to student's goals and objectives and to his maintenance.	19	32
1	2	5. Question not relevant; student probably not able to enhance himself in any situation at this time.	8	13
1	2	6. No data.	0	0
7	13	7. Student had mixed feelings: values education and degree but regrets aspects of social/community life. Feels he "missed" something and has some uncertainties about recommending U.C. to others or choosing it again himself.	0	0
52		TOTAL ... TOTAL	60	

Post-Chicago Educational Experience

Persisters			Drop Outs	
No.	%		No.	%
		1. Attended and received degree from another institution.	21	35
		2. Attending (full or part time) and will presumably graduate from another institution.	19	32
		3. Attended one or more other institutions; no degree.	2	3
		4. Student working (or married - for women); plans to continue education when feasible.	11	18
		5. Student working (or married - for women); no plans for further education.	6	10
0	0	6. No data.	1	2
35	67	7. Graduate study		
8	15	8. Teaching		
3	6	9. Marriage (for women; no other specific plans)		
5	10	0. A "job"		
1	2	* Unknown		
52		TOTAL TOTAL	60	

APPENDIX III

Correlations Between Selected Quantitative and Qualitative Variables for Drop Outs Interviewed.*

No.	Qualitative Variable	Sex	Father's Occupation	Religion	S.A.T. Verbal	S.A.T. Math
4	Academic-Educational Goals	-.13	-.20	-.21		
5	Relationship with Adults	.08	-.30	-.23		
6	Relationship with Peers	-.32	-.05	.09		
7	Socialization	-.17	.00	.06		
9	Social Issues	-.27	.09	.09	.18	.07
10	Traditionalism	-.65	.24	.22	-.31	.38
11	Intellectualism	-.05	-.14	.07	.16	-.18
12	Tolerance of Diversity	-.54	.24	.25	-.14	.50
13	Self-Directedness	-.33	-.33	.03	-.13	.09
14	Self-Assessment	-.18	-.38	-.07	-.11	-.07
15	Acceptance of Diversity	.01	.01	-.06	.30	.31
16	Emotional Flexibility	-.16	-.24	-.08	.20	.11
17	Functional Efficiency	-.11	-.35	-.15	.15	-.03
19	Expectation of Ethos	.28	.12	.19		
20	Expectation of Adults	.07	-.30	.19		
21	Expectation of Peers	-.05	.32	.19		
24	Perceptions of Curriculum	-.10	-.26		.11	.09
25	Study Skills	-.15	-.15		.07	.05
26	Perceptions of Ethos	-.34	.16	.21	.23	.38
27	Perceptions of Faculty	-.27	.05	.25	.15	-.15
28	Perceptions of Advisers	.29	.35	.20		
29	Perceptions - Residence Staff	-.02	.03	.20		
30	Perceptions of Peers	-.43	.29	.22	-.02	.31
37	Cause of Difficulty	.01	.14	.15	.14	.03

* See Chapter Five for Description.